AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

I.—AGGLUTINATION AND ADAPTATION.

II.

THE ROOT *dhē* IN AGGLUTINATIVE GROUPS.—In A. J. P. XV,
p. 217 sq., I explained the gerundive in -*en-dae* as made up of
an infin.-noun in -$\underset{\circ}{m}$+a dat. from √ *dhē*,[1] and equated the suffix

[1] In the same number of the Journal an explanation of this form was
published by Mr. L. Horton-Smith that proceeded on much the same lines.
The suffixal -*d*- he ascribed, after some debate, to √*do*, as against √*dhē*, on
the ground of the Osc.-Umbr. gerundives in -*n*- ‖ -*nn*-. To this decision he
was led by the belief that Aryan -*dh*- must become *f* (<þ) in these dialects.
It is, however, demonstrable, I believe, that Aryan -*ndh*- gave Osc.-Umbr.
-*n*þ->-*nd*->-*nn*- ‖ -*n*-. I take it that Umbr. *enom* ‖ *ennom* 'then' is kindred
with Lat. *in-de*, Grk. ἐν-θεν, and represents a primitive **en-dhom*, with suffix
nearly parallel to that in the Lat. preposition *en-do* ‖ *in-du*. Comparable is
also *quan-do*. Another form of similar make-up is the form *pone* ‖ *ponne*
(<**qom-dhe*) 'cum,' represented in Latin by *un-de*, with loss of *q*° as in *ut, ubi*,
etc. (cf. the author in Class. Rev. VIII, p. 447, and Part I, p. 417). Other
material can also be explained on the basis of this law (cf. von Planta, Gram.
d. osk.-umbr. Spr., p. 468), if we assume that -*nd*- was estopped in its passage
to -*nn*- in certain consonantal environments. Against this law Osc. *anafríss*
may be urged, but as to this word we cannot be sure of its meaning (cf.
Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. XXXVII 644), and its -*fr*- can be ascribed to -*bhr*- or
to -*sr*- (von Planta, l. c., p. 455). I remark that in any case -*n*þr- doubtless
had a different phonetic treatment from intervocalic -*n*þ-. The passage of -*sr*-
into -þr-, thence -*fr*-, certain for Latin and probable for Italic (von Planta,
l. c., p. 476), warrants us in believing that -þr- from any source was not liable
to change. If, however, these comparisons are unsatisfactory to anybody, I
have but to remark that there was an Aryan doublet to *ndh*, viz. *nd* (cf.
Noreen, Urgerm. Lautlehre, §51, 2), represented in Greek πυθμήν ‖ πύνδαξ
'bottom.'

with Sk. -*a-dh(y)ăi*, Grk. -*ε-<σ>-θαι* for -*a-<σ>-θαι*[1]; the two last had already been brought together by Bartholomae (Rhein. Mus. XLV 151 sq.). It is to be noted that this infin. is used as an impv. (Part I, p. 439). We shall not go amiss, then, if we recognize the same origin in the impv. suffix -*dhi*, Grk. -*θι*, Sk. -(*d*)*hĭ*.[2] In Sk. we have a doublet *kuru* ‖ *kuru-hi*; Lat. *ī* ‖ Grk. *ĭ-θι* 'go' may serve for an Aryan example. The nature of the form in -*dhi* is disclosed by the Lat. locutions *fac ames* ‖ *amā* 'do love' ‖ 'love,' emphatic and unemphatic. In the infinitives also there was the doublet *ag-ṃ+dhăi* and *agam* (cf. the author, A. J. P. XV, p. 218). From these sources √*dhă* penetrated into verb-inflexion. In Latin also this impv. termination is to be found in a modified form in the enclitic -*dum*, e. g. *age-dum*. It is also seen in *ce-do* (infra, footnote), which is precisely comparable with the adv.-prep. *en-do* in formation. The earliest form of the suffix -*dhi* we do not certainly know. It may, after all, base on a demonstrative stem, for √*dhē* means 'put,' and *put* is very clearly a demonstrative.[3] The earliest formations with *-dhĕ*

[1] But -*a-(σ)θαι* is preserved in *πρίασθαι*.

[2] For -*ĭ* cf. RV. VII 31, 4; -*ĭ* is also found in older Avestan and in old Persian.

[3] This point requires no demonstration on the semasic side. As a conversational word *put* means nothing save in so far as it is supplemented by a directive adverb. Under the conception of the impv. ending -*θι* as a demonstrative we have no difficulty in identifying it with the case-ending -*θι*, as in *κηρό-θι* (Homer, 9 times) 'in the heart.' Other varieties of the same termination are seen in *ἐν-θα, ἐν-θεν*. In -*θα* of *ἐν-θα* 'there, thither' I see the undifferentiated Aryan -*a* of the stem: -*θι* in the verb is due to assimilation to the primary endings, and in the noun to the locative -*ι* (cf. Part I, p. 423). There is every reason, on the semasic side, to claim kinship between this -*θι* of the 'where' locative and -*δε* of the 'whither' locative. In point of phonetic kinship we would have to set up an Aryan doublet *dha* ‖ *da*. Our warrant for doing so is not limited to Greek, for Goth. *du* ‖ Ger. *zu* implies the same variation in the initials. I cite the following forms referable to this Aryan demonstrative doublet *dha* ‖ *da*: Avest. reflex. *dim* (cf. Avest. *hī-m*, Lat. *se, i<p>-se*, with *<p>* from *eum<p>se*, Grk. *ἑ* and *ἑαυτόν* for a similar réflexive turn to a demonstrative stem); Lat. *ī-dem*, Grk. *ὅ-δε, δεῖνα* (like *κεῖνος* in formation, with *a* = Aryan *a*, Part I, p. 425), akin to which is *οὐ-δείς*, on which popular etymology has been at work, Homeric *ἰδέ* 'and' (cf. Lat. *idem* 'likewise'), Sk. *i-dam*, and the infixed -*d*-, -*da*- in O.Irish (cf. Wind., Ir. Texte, pp. 513, 515). Greek preserves the doublet in the adverbial forms *δή* ‖ *θην*, which are of closely parallel use: thus with the impv. A 545 *μὴ δή* . . . *ἐπιέλπεο*) (N 620 *λείψετέ θην* . . . *νέας*, where *λείψετε* is *fut.* impv., cf. *ὄψεσθε*, Ω 704, and Seymour's Lang. and Verse of Homer, §30; *ἐπειδή*) (*ἐπεί θην*, π 91;

passed into the root just as was assumed above (Part I, p. 435)
for the -*kĕ*-formations. Thus it is pretty generally agreed that
Sk. √*yudh* 'fight' is an extension of √*yu* 'unite,' by √*dhē* (Brug.,
Gr. II, §689).

The ENDING IN -*dha* EXTENDED itself beyond the infin.-impv.:
Sk. 1st plur. -*ma-hi*, -*ma-he*, Avest. *mai*-δέ, Grk. -*με-θα*. In the
Sk. ending -*ma-hi* (act. -*ma*) we have probably an emphatic
extension based on the impv. doublet *kuru* ‖ *kuru-hi*. The Sk.
and Avest. primary endings are made to accord with the other
middles (infra, p. 17), and especially with the infinitives in
-*dh*(*y*)*ăi*. In Grk. *με-θα* we either have -*dha* with the primitive
vocalization retained, or considering the form -*με-σθα* (? or -*μεσ-θα*,
ἱκόμεσθα 9 times, μαχομέσθα 3 times in Homer), the 2d sg. ending
-*σθα* has affected the vocalization by a conscious[1] interpretation
as 'I+thou.'

In Sk. 2D PLUR. -*dhvam* ‖ -*dhuvam*, Avest. -*đwem* ‖ Gāthic
-*dūm*, the same demonstrative must lurk; with -*dhvam* 2d dual
-*σθον* has already been compared, but the -*σ*- has not been satis-
factorily explained, and we cannot be certain of *σθϜον. In Aryan
there were the two impv. endings *sa* (Grk. -*σο*, Lat. -*re*) and *s-wa*
(Sk. -*sva*), of which the latter is a compound demonstrative (Part
I, p. 412). There was also the impv. ending -*dha*. In Sk.
-*dhva-m* I see a similar compound demonstrative, -*dha*+*va-m* (for
-*m* see below, p. 16). IN GRK. 2D DUAL -*σθον* I see *sa*+*dha-m*.
It is possible, however, to explain 2D PLUR. -*σθε* as equal to 2d
sg. pf. -*σθα* (Part I, p. 418; infra, p. 16), and thus connect with the
Sk. act. ending -*tha*.[2] The two explanations do not exclude one

apodotic, δή, E 898) (θην, I 394. Greek has a further demonstrative in δεῦρο,
from *δε+*ορο* (Kaegi, Gr. Gram.[2], §227, 4), *ορο being related to ἄλλος (Part
I, p. 433); the sense 'hither' comes from the *δε, a demonstrative sign to a
distant person (*ara*-). Latin has a similar composition in *de-in* ‖ *in-de*, where
the pronominal stem *a-n* appears. To δεῦρο belong δεύτερος 'second,' δεύτατος
'last'; cf. Lat. *alter* 'second' : *ultra* 'afar.' On the meaning cf., however,
Brugmann in KZ. XXV, p. 299. I note that δεῦρο makes a quasi-plural
δεῦτε. Of comparable formation is Lat. *ce-do*, where -*do* is a demonstrative
suffix, and this too has shaped itself a plural in -*t-te*.

[1] An agglutinative origin for the endings makes it necessary to consider the
psychological moment as everywhere present. Back of -*μες* lies a conscious
'we.'

[2] Hillebrandt (BB. XVIII, p. 279) has previously made the same explanation,
but this was unknown to me when the first draft of my own explanation was
made. There are no impeccable examples of Grk. θ = Sk. *th*, *pace* Zubaty

another. In both Sk. and Grk. the emphatic -*dh*-forms were put in the 'MIDDLE' (infra, p. 17); and in Grk. the -σθ- was generalized as a substitute for -θ- in verb-inflexion.

It seems possible also to find here the LAT. 2D SG. IMPV. *mino*,[1] Osc.-Umbr. -*mo*. The phonetics involved can be illustrated from Lat. *īmus* beside *inf-ra*. The earliest Italic was *$n\overset{\circ}{d}$+*mo*-, whence *inbmo-, *immo-, *īmo*-. In -*mino* I see *-*ăm*+*na*, whence *$mm'no$, -*mino*. It is not absolutely necessary, however, to operate with -*ăm*- if we treat Sk. -*dhvam* as a direct representative of an Aryan form, whence in Latin the development would normally be -*dvam*>-*bam*, and, in monosyllabic roots, -*bm*-[2] (>-*mm*-), to which was added the *impv.* suffix -*na* (cf. Brug., Gr. II, §1010); in the Vedas this suffix was freely added to 2d act. impv. -*ta* (Wh.², §§549, 618). We could thus interpret the -*i*- of -*mino* as anaptyptic. As regards the relation of Osc.-Umbr. -*m-o* to -*m'no*, it is possible that -*m*- is for -*mn*- (cf. v. Planta, l. c.,

(KZ. XXXI, p. 1): οἶσθα, whence the ending -σθα (: Sk. -*tha*) spread in Greek, can never have been dissociated from 2d sg. impv. ἴσθι; cf. also ἦσθα and ἴσθι (εἰμί). For Wackernagel's equation of Sk. 2d sg. -*thās* with Grk. 2d sg. aor. passive -θη-ς, I refer to the explanation to be given presently. Zubaty's comparison of ἀθήρ 'ear of wheat' with Sk. *atharī* 'etwa spitze' fails because of ἄνθος 'flower'; cf. ἀνθέριξ 'ear of corn.' The comparison of ῥόθος 'swift motion, noise' with *rātha-s* 'chariot' is not conclusive. Joh. Schmidt's comparison with OHG. *stredan* 'fervere' is as good, and Bechtel's comparison with Sk. *vrādhat* 'noisy stream' is still better (BB. XX, p. 255). I suggest myself that the word is Sk. √*rā* 'bark, roar, flow' (: √*ri*, infra, p. 5) with the -*dha* extension. In Aeschylus's πολυρρόθιος 'loud roaring (wave)' the -ρρ- comes from πολύρρυτος 'strong-flowing (sea).' Homeric ἐπίρροθος meant 'cheerer on'; compare ἐπιρρύζω 'set on a dog' (Aristophanes); the -ρρ- comes from association with ἐπίρρησις 'rebuke' (Archil.): √*vrē* (or ? √*ser*). The θ in πλαθάνη 'board' derives from *πλατνη, with τν>θν (cf. Curt., Etym.⁵, p. 502; Feist, Got. Etym., s. v. *ahana*, χν<κν): the same phonetic relation in λανθάνω : Lat. *latere*; φάτνη ‖ πάθνη 'manger' is better connected with πατέομαι 'feed' than with πίθος 'cask' (cf. Prellwitz, s. v.). Association with other congeners often estopped the change, e. g. in πίτνημι. We can explain μανθάνω 'learn' as *$m\partial n$+*dha* 'put in <one's own> mind, learn' = Lat. *mandāre* 'put in <another's> mind, suggest, enjoin'; cf. Sk. *mandhātár*- 'der Sinnige.' For further remarks on Sk. -*tha* compare below, p. .

[1] But also 3d plural; cf. *appellamino*, MS reading in Cicero de Leg. III 3, 8.

[2] For the change of ŏ*m* (þ*m*) to ŏ*m* (*fm*) in Oscan I cite Osc. *imaden* = Lat. *imā*<*d*>+*in*. Therefore I have represented the change as Italic. Thurneysen's explanation of *imus* from *ins-mo because of Ir. *iss* is entirely unnecessary, for *iss* is itself referable to *$n\overset{\circ}{dh}$+*tó* with a different superlative suffix but otherwise identical with *imus* from *$n\overset{\circ}{dh}$+*mo*.

§152), i. e. -*mmo* was the first form : we could thus see in Umbr. 3d plur. impv. -*mᵘmo* an anaptyctic vowel.

The ending -*dhᵛam* may also lurk in the Lat. FUT. 2D PLUR. (pass.) °*bᶦmini*, which was susceptible to employment as an imperative. Its phonetic history may be illustrated thus : post-tonic -*dvₐmnī* > -*bimᶦnī*. For *ī* of the ending -*nī* in this deponent ('middle') form the source must be sought in -*ī* of the pf. It is generally agreed, however, that the ending -*minī* is participial, or infinitival (cf. Stolz in Hdbch. II², §98). With a 2d plural -*minī* already in the language, the extension of the *bi-* of *bi-mini* to the entire fut.-tense system is rendered easy. The impf. -*bās*, -*bat*, etc., would be modelled on -*bis*, -*bit*, like *er-ās*, *er-at* to *eris*, *erit*.

But an explanation of the -*b*-fut. in Latin must also suit the -*b*-fut. in O.Irish, and it seems possible that *dw* becomes *db*, *b* in this language (Brug., Gr. I, §175). But another explanation has also occurred to me, which I now proceed to give, viz. Lat. fut. -*bī*- = Grk. -*θη*- of the aor.-fut. passive.[1] Before this thesis can be proved it will be necessary to prove (A) that the ARYAN LANGUAGE HAD A CONFUSION OF *ē* AND *ī*, and (B) that the CELTIC LANGUAGE SHOWS, like Latin, A PASSAGE OF -*đ*- (þ) INTO -*b*-.

A. The phonetic interval between a close *ē* and an open *ī* is almost nothing. We know that in Latin *ei* was a variant spelling for either (cf. V. Henry, l. c., §§29, 33). In one Italic word the spelling with *ī* for *ē* is universal; cf. *fīlius* 'suckling' ‖ *fēmina* 'she who suckles.' In Sk. *ī* is very frequent as a variant to *ā* in roots that are known to have Aryan *ē*. This has been gravely ascribed to 'apt Ablaut's artful aid,' as if naming a thing explained it. I cite to Aryan √ *mē* the double present systems Sk. *māti* ‖ *mimīte*[2]; to Aryan *dhē* 'suck' Sk. *a-dhā-t* ‖ *dhī-tá*, and,

---

[1] It was one of the tenets of the first students of linguistics that these Greek tenses were formed agglutinatively, and in -*θη*- they recognized the root of *τί-θη-μι*. Wackernagel (KZ. XXX, p. 302) and V. Henry (Gram. Comp.², §102, footnote) have explained the -*θης* as an ending = Sk. 2d sg. mid. -*thās*, and on this *sole* foundation the entire aor.-fut. pass. has been built up. The theory has another great objection : there is no proof for Grk. -*θ*- = Sk. -*th*- (supra, p. 2), and many certain etymologies seem to contradict it.

[2] I find in the reduplicating vowel -*i*- of the present proof of the correctness of this view. Thus if we recognize the root as *mē̆* ‖ *mĭ*, we understand how the second form might reduplicate *mi-mī-*.

with 'guna,' *dhenú*[1] 'cow'; to Aryan √ *dhē* 'put' Sk. aorists
dhā-mahe ∥ *dhī-mahi*.   As to the form *dhī-mahi* there seems to
be a confusion in the famous Sāvitrī verse as to whether it
comes from √ *dhā* 'put' or √ *dhī* 'think' (cf. Whitney's note in
Kaegi's RV., Am. ed., n. 222).   Aryan √ *dhē* seems to have
developed the meaning 'think' in other languages.   We have in
Homer the locutions θεῖναί τινί τι ἐν φρεσί (Φ 145), and θέσθαι ἐν
φρεσί (δ 729) c. infin. 'to think of doing a thing.'   Even more
explicit is φ 333 τί δ' ἐλέγχεα ταῦτα τίθεσθε 'why do you put this
<down> an insult to yourselves.'   For further examples see
L. and Sc., s. v. τίθημι B. II.   The same usage belongs to Lat.
fa-cio: thus Cic. N. D. I 8, 19 Plato construi a deo mundum facit.
Very common is the impv. *fac* 'put case, suppose' (cf. L. and Sh.,
s. v. I B. 4–6).   In Sanskrit forms of √ *dhā* show this meaning (cf.
Lanman, Sk. Read., s. v. √ *dhā* 9); but this meaning was provided
for more particularly by the forms in *dhī*°, which thus developed
into value as a 'root.'   So √ *dhē* 'suck' is but a specialization of
√ *dhē* 'put.'   If we note the Aryan idiom vouched for by Sk.
gárbham + √ *dhā*, Grk. θέσθαι υἱόν 'conceive a child in the womb,'
we can see in Lat. *fē-mina* 'woman' a ptc. meaning 'she who
conceives,' whence the passage to 'suckling mother' is natural
enough.[2]

Greek also gives its warrant for -*ī*- in congeners of this root:
θίς, gen. θῑν-ός 'beach,' Sk. *dhánu* ∥ *dhanū́* 'deposit, sand-bank.'
In the latter form the accentuation has shortened the previous
syllable.   There was doubtless an Aryan doublet *dhēn* ∥ *dhīn*.
To this group Lat. *fīn-is* 'boundary' also belongs.   The banks
of streams are natural boundaries.[3]   O.Ir. *dūn* 'arx' also belongs
here; one meaning of Sk. *dhanū́* is 'promontory'; the Eng. word
dune is said by Kluge (s. v. *düne*) to have been borrowed from

---

[1] I see no reason why the diphthong here (*e* < *ei*) may not be on the same
footing as the Lat. variant orthography and pronunciation of *ē* ∥ *ī* by *ei*.
Comparable also is the so-called spurious diphthong *ei* in Grk. for *ē*.   In line
with this are the Sk. pfs. in *e* to roots in *a* (Aryan *ei* : *ē*); cf. Lat. *frēgī* : *fra(n)go*
(infra, p. 26).

[2] Perhaps the semasy had another development: Ω 58 Ἕκτωρ μὲν θνητός τε
γυναῖκά τε θήσατο μαζόν means 'made a woman put <down> her breast' (cf.
ο 506 παραθείμην δαῖτα 'have meat set before one').   The only other passage
is δ 89 ἀλλ' αἰεὶ παρέχουσιν ἐπηετανὸν γάλα θῆσθαι 'they always have milk to set
<before> themselves,' where παρέχουσιν θῆσθαι may be for παρ' ἐχουσιν θῆσθαι.

[3] I cite Sall. Jug. 79, 3 Neque *flumen* neque mons erat qui *fines* eorum
discerneret.   I note that with the semasy thus vouched for, one ought to be
careful about separating ὅρος 'boundary' from ὄρος 'mountain.'

this Celtic word, and it still preserves the sense of 'sand-bank.'
The primitive Celtic was *dēnū*, whence *dūn* by infection (cf.
Windisch, Ir. Gram., §22, and the forms *laigiu* ‖ *lugu*, *ber-u* ‖
do-bur). I further suggest that in φῖ-τυ 'son, scion' we have a
*θῖ-τυ affected in its initial part by φυτόν 'scion.' Dialectic vari-
ations of φ° ‖ θ° would help to this (cf. the author in Proc. A. P.
A., 1894, p. ix).[1] Along with this demonstration of the doublet
dhē- ‖ *dhī-* we reach a different point of view for judging the Sk.
ptc. *hi-tá*, Grk. θε-τός. I see here no *dhə-tó*, but merely the
shorts to the corresponding longs (cf. Bechtel, Hauptprobleme,
pp. 98, 151).

I add some additional Greek examples that are more or less
plausible: ἰθύς from *sīdhús* : Sk. *sādhús*; ἦνι-ς,[2] an epithet of a
'heifer,' and ἴνις 'son, daughter'; ἥκω ‖ ἵκω[3] 'come,' to which the
spelling εἵκω also occurs dialectically (Doric), an orthography
showing association perhaps with εἶμι 'go.'[4]

---

[1] I there suggested that Grk. φώρ 'thief' is for θώρ, Lat. *fūr*, Sk. *dhūr-ta*, with
influence from φέρειν 'carry off, <plunder>,' and especial association with the
doublet φήρ ‖ θήρ 'wild-beast.' As confirmation of the latter suggestion I note
the proverb cited by Arist. (Eth. E. 7, 1, 5): ἔγνω δὲ φὼρ τε φῶρα καὶ λύκος λύκον.
The wolf was *ferus* in Latin, and his character as a thief is attested by Tibull.
I 1, 33 At vos exiguo pecori, furesque lupīque ‖ parcite.

[2] There is probable kinship with ἤ-βη 'youth.' The rough breathing may
be that we see in Ἐστία. I suggest that this had a pietistic origin. Greek
was possessed of a group of words for which ἀγής 'accursed' and ἀγνός 'holy'
are representative. The latter was a frequent epithet of divinities, and
possibly its aspiration was extended to names of divinities beginning with
vowels. If we bear in mind that ἄγος meant a 'thing polluted' in a religious
sense, while ἅγος meant a 'thing sanctified,' it does not seem hard to believe
that the rough breathing was a conscious point of reverential pronunciation.
One hears very commonly in America a pronunciation of the name of the
deity something like *Gäwd* in the pulpit, even where the current pronunci-
ation is *Gŏd*. This I have always associated with the reverential intention
(cf. Whitney, however, on Sporadic Phonetic Change, IF. IV, p. 32). In the
lips of some such speakers there is a marked intensification of this aberrant
pronunciation. We use in English a long-continued spirant (*sh* = Sk. *ç̌*) in
the sense of the Grk. εὐφήμει, Lat. *favē linguā*. Possibly the Greek pietistic
rough breathing has some connection with this. The pietistic influence can
be seen in *Schepfer* 'creator,' but *schepper* 'dipper' in the Silesian dialects (cf.
Weinhold, Ueber deutsche Dialectforschung, p. 73; cited by Wiener, Mod.
Lang. Notes, X, No. 1).

[3] The root is *sē* in ἵημι 'send,' i. e. 'cause to go,' but the *-κε-* has become a
permanent part of the stem (Part I, p. 435). The congeners of Grk. ὁδός 'road'
are doubtless extensions by *-de-* of the same root *sē*.

[4] Or ει is on the footing of the diphthong in *dhenú-* (supra, p. 6, n. 1).

Another example is furnished by ἥρως, where the rough breathing was pietistic. The unaffected etymological form is found in ἥρανος 'guard, friend' and in ἠρίον 'hero's grave.' Sk. *vāraṇá* (RV.) 'strong, powerful,' *vắra* 'treasure,' Lat. *vēr-us* 'true' are congeners. The root was doubtless *vṛ* 'cover, close.' In Sk. *vīra* 'hero,' Lat. *vir* and *vir-tus* we have the *ĭ* vowel. Eng. *close* (adj.), *to close* (vb.) show a striking semasic parallel, e. g. 'a *close* friend does not betray a secret.'

B. The prevailing doctrine at present is that in Celtic -*dh*- became -*d*-, and that then this -*d*- became *đ*. There is no reason why -*dh*- did not become -*đ*- at once in intervocalic position, and -*d*- otherwise. From this source original Aryan -*d*- received its impulse to become -*đ*-. For the passage of -*đ*- into -*b*- I submit the following etymologies: 1. O.Ir. *ucht* 'breast' is akin to Lat. *über*, Grk. οὖθαρ, gen. *ουθṇτ-ος*, Sk. *ūdhar*, gen. *ūdhnas*. The phonetic chain of the Celtic word may be thus represented: *ū*dh-ṇ-t-* > **ūđ-ṇ-t-* > **ūḃṇt-* > *ūbit (cf. *it* 'sunt,' Brug., Gr. I, §243, 3) > *ūbt* (i. e. *upt) > *ucht*[1] (cf. *secht* = *septem*). 2. O.Ir. *lucht* 'people' <in attendance>, *luchtaire* 'lanista,' Lat. *līber* 'free,' *lībertus* 'freedman' (still in attendance on his master), Grk. ἐλεύθερος 'free.' The primary sense was 'noisy, outspoken'[2]: *Līber* and Ἴακχος, titles of the wine-god, both meant 'shouter.'

---

[1] I find it hard to believe that *ucht* 'breast' and *uball* 'apple' are not congeneric. It is a common modern association of ideas, and Ar. Lys. 155, Eccl. 903 use μῆλον in the sense of 'breasts.' In the Anthology κυδωνιάω 'swell like a quince' and μηλοῦχος 'apple-holding (girdle)' are used of the breasts. There is also a passage of exquisite beauty in Aucassin et Nicolète (xii, l. 23), where the breasts are likened to two walnuts. It is clear from all the uses of μῆλον that the name was suggested by the shape; the word may be connected with *mā* 'mother,' and have had a primary meaning of 'breast,' which was crowded out in Greek by μαζός, and in Latin by *mamma*. It has been supposed that the word *apple* (cf. Kluge, s. v. *Apfel*) has been derived from *Abella*, a small locality in Italy famous for its apples. But just the contrary thing may have taken place. Into the vocalization of this group space forbids me to go. The acceptance of primitive kinship would demand the acceptance of a European change of -*đ*- to -*b*-. We might, however, avoid this difficulty by recognizing influence from the group of which ὀμφαλός 'navel' is a representative: I note that the Latin pair *umbilicus* 'navel,' *umbo* 'boss of a shield' (with Aryan -*bh*-) is represented in O.Ir. by *imbliu* and *uball* 'apple on a shield' (cf. Wind., s. v.).

[2] For ἐλεύθερος 'outspoken' cf. the author in A. J. P. XV, p. 220, f. n.; examples for *līber* are Pl. Cist. 127–8 Quiaque adeo me complevi flore Liberi | magis *libera* uti lingua conlubitumst mihi; Liv. XXXV 32, 6 vocem liberam mittere adversus aliquem.

The great festival at Ἐλευσίς had on the fifth day a procession to Eleusis called the procession of Iakchos, which was of a very noisy character.[1] Thus it is clear that Ἐλευσίς belongs to the same group. In Lat. *liberi* 'children' we must see a primary sense of 'noisy.' In Ir. *lūth* 'joy' (yearning?) we have the same facet of meaning; and if we see in *lūath* 'quick' an underlying notion of noisy motion, we are able to bring ἐλεύθω 'go' into this group. On the phonetic side I would see in *lucht* the development of an -*n*-stem lengthened by -*t*- like that in *ucht*; in *libertus* the corresponding -*r*-stem[2] (extended also by *t*) is seen. 3. We have in Irish a word *rúad* 'red' corresponding to Lat. *ruber*, Sk. *rudhirá*; *rucht*[3] (<*rubit*, cf. Sk. *rohit-* 'red') 'red <tunic>' seems to be an indubitable congener. The conclusion to be drawn from these three examples is that the Latin -*đ*- which passes into -*b*- began to make that change in the Italo-Celtic period.[4]

Returning from this digression to the discussion of the *b*-forms, I seek to prove that in the fut. -*bit* we have composition with -*dhē*-. According to this theory a fut. *calebit* must have been at one time *calefit. This constructed form is in actual existence (save for the quantity of the *e*[5]) in the sense of 'is made warm,' a pr. pass. to *calefacio*. When the form *calefit was in this state, its termination was associated with *fit*, 3d sg. pass. to *facio*, and forms like *calefacio* created, but this did not keep the form from

[1] I cite from Stengel (Iw. Müller's Hdbch. V 3, p. 123): "Jakchoszug hiess die Prozession nach dem Gotte.... Es ist eine Gottheit, dem Bakchos nahe verwandt, der Gott der lärmenden Freude."

[2] I note that *vir* and *homo* have *r*- and *n*-stems; variation of *r*- (*l*-) and *n*- is seen in Eng. *girl*: Lat. (gen.) *virgin-is* (cf. H. Möller in P.-BB. VII, p. 542, who reconstructs a reduplicated stem *gherghen-); there is ultimate relation, too, between πατήρ 'father' and πότνια 'lady.'

[3] Windisch, s. v. "*i. inar, ut dixit Fercertne: hi n-deich ruchtaib derga*, Corm., p. 39"; *inar* means 'tunic' and *derga* after *ruchtaib* means 'red'; *rucht* 'tunic' is doubtless an extension like Lat. *purpura* 'toga' and our 'purple and fine linen.' I note the language of a little girl, who asked me one day: "Have I got on a flannel and a white to-day or two whites?" <sc. petticoats>.

[4] In all the O.Irish forms the change seems conditioned on a *t* following the -*đ*-, and this -*t* is possibly present in the background of all the Latin words (*rubidus* for *rubitus, cf. the author in A. J. P. XIII, p. 475); by this explanation it will be easier to explain *iubeo* (3d sg. *iubet*), which was entirely devoid of noun-kindred to hold it in place, as e. g. *fides* : *fido*, etc.

[5] The lengthening took place in the quadrisyllabic forms, *calēbitis* like *cupīdinis* : *cupĭdus*, and is comparable with that in σοφώτερος.

passing on to *calebit.* I thus endow my verb with the form *calet* 'is dry' and **calefit* 'is made dry'[1]; they were adapted to different uses, and *calebit* became a fut., helped to this, perhaps, by the form *erit* (infra, p. 21); but certainly no English-speaker would find it hard to believe that the fut. sense has developed directly from the pres. Beside *erit* and *eram* there grew up a pair *calebit* and *calebam.*

The phonetics involved in this explanation have been already explained on the basis of an Aryan doublet $\check{e} \parallel \check{\imath}$ and the Italo-Celtic change $d > b$. Implicit in this explanation is the assignment of Lat. *fio* to Aryan $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$. This identification of the earlier 'linguisticians'[2] has been latterly abandoned. Brugmann constructs *fio* from **bhu̯-i̯ŏ* (Gr. I, §56) and from **fu̯-io* (ib. II, §707). Bartholomae (Stud. z. i.-g. Spr.-Gesch. II, p. 191) writes the base **bhu̯īi̯o*, with an $\bar{\imath}$ to suit his $\bar{a}i \parallel \bar{a}/\bar{\imath}$[3] series. But with the numerous Sk. forms in which $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$ appears as *dhī*- (supra, p. 5), who shall say we do not have the same phenomenon in Latin? If *fio* belongs to $\sqrt{bh\bar{u}}$, why does it everywhere appear as the pass. of *facio*[4]? It is incredible to me that, with a large development of $\sqrt{bh\bar{u}}$ in Latin (*fui, fuat, futurus,* etc.), such utter

[1] i. e. 'becomes dry'; note the Germ. fut. auxiliary *werden.*

[2] This neologism should be as good as 'statistician,' 'logician,' etc.

[3] On the basis of a few highly questionable Sk. preterites in -*āit* for -*ĭt* (cf. Wh.[2], §904 *b*), Bartholomae makes an ingenious but altogether improbable plea for such a series. The forms are *viçarāir* (AV. XII 3, 18), *pdrāçarāit* (ib. VI 66, 2), *dçarāit* (ib. VI 32, 2), but there are MS variants in -*is*, -*ĭt* for all the passages. The forms *ajāir* (RV. IX 72, 5), *apājāit* (AV. XII 3, 54) are to be explained as belonging to $\sqrt{ji}$, as Prof. Whitney assured me in a private letter (cf. also his Vb.-Roots, s. v. $\sqrt{ji}$). In AV. XII 3, 18 *viçarāis* is certainly an 'injunctive.' I see in it nothing but a 2d pers. to the dithematic -*āi* of the 1st pers. (Part I, p. 439), which was not primitively a 'middle,' but corresponds to the monothematic ending in Grk. opt. φέρ-οις. The augmented forms are susceptible to the same explanation, for the augment had originally no past value. Nothing is commoner in Vedic style than the occurrence of an augmented aor. in a string of petitions, and the explanation in vogue is what may be called the explanation from *naïveté*, which makes the petitioner express the thing wished for as the thing realized. But as the unaugmented forms are injunctive or narrative, I see no reason why the augmented forms may not now and then be narrative or injunctive (Part I, p. 422). A warrant for this usage is found in the Greek aorist as a future and a hortative (cf. Goodwin, M. and T., §§61–62). Explanation of this phenomenon is to be sought in the original timelessness of the verb. The -*s*-fut. and aor. developed from the same or cognate agglutinative groups (Part I, p. 422).

[4] Cf. *fitum est* for *factum* (Liv. Andron. ap. Non. 475, 16).

phonetic and semasic dissociation should have been made. It seems to be natural for a '*be made*' to pale in signification to a mere copula '*be*,' but the converse process is much more difficult to grant.

The most plausible justification of these monstrous-looking forms **bhu̯i̯o*, etc. (which look even worse written **bhw̥i̯yo*) is the equation of Lat. °*fio* in *suffio* 'fumigate' with Grk. θύω 'sacrifice.' Now, the shift of meanings in θύω and its kin is absolutely Protean (cf. Prellwitz, s. v.). From Sk. √ *dhū* ‖ *dhu-kṣ* 'kindle,' θύω 'offer <in the fire>,' and °*fio* 'fumigate' we cannot go wrong in ascribing to this group an Aryan sense of 'kindle.' But there is more than a hint of the self-same semasy for √ *dhē*. In Latin comedy the phrase *rem divinam facere* 'sacrifice' is very common, and *facere* ‖ *fieri* is used alone in this sense (cf. L. and Sh., s. v. I B. 8). Grk. τίθημι comes close to this in its sense of 'offer to the gods' (cf. L. and Sc., s. v. A. III 2).[1] Much more pertinent is the use of τίθημι as a *terminus technicus*[2] for gathering the firewood. In Sanskrit *ā +* √ *dhā*[3] was the special *terminus technicus* for kindling the sacrificial fire. If we note that Lat. *suf-fio* is not restricted to the sense 'fumigate,' but also means in general 'burn' (Lucr. II 1098), it will be possible to regard this °*fio* too as belonging to √ *dhē* ‖ *dhī*. To this conclusion we seem led by a comparison between the Roman and Hindu funeral rites. Festus (p. 3, Müll.) thus employs the word *suffitio*: funus prosecuti redeuntes ignem supergradiebantur aqua aspersi; quod purgationis genus vocabant suffitionem. Similarly in the Hindu ritual, after the burial of a *Guru* they carry off the old fire and, returning, kindle a new one (Āçvalāyana Gṛh. Sū. IV 6, 1–6): "when all sounds have ceased, or when <the others> have gone to the house or the resting-place, <the performer of the cere-

---

[1] I note Z 92–3 θεῖναι <πέπλον> ’Αθηναίης ἐπὶ γούνασιν ἠυκόμοιο | καί οἱ ὑποσχέσθαι δυοκαίδεκα βοῦς ἐνὶ νηῷ.

[2] Cf. Aristophanes, Pax 1023 sq.:

σέ τοι θύρασι χρὴ μένοντα τοίνυν
σχίζας δευρὶ τιθέναι ταχέως
. . . .
οὔκουν δοκῶ σοι μαντικῶς τὸ φρύγανον τίθεσθαι,

where the word μαντικῶς clinches this statement.

[3] I note for Latin Plaut. Rud. 767 ignem magnum hic faciam, and Capt. 843 iube ... ignem ingentem fieri. We have possibly a compound of √*dhē* in Mil. 411 inde ignem in aram, unless indeed *inde* is to be referred to Sk. √*indh* 'kindle,' a root warranted for Italic by *aedes, aestus*, etc.

mony> should pour out an uninterrupted stream of water, begin-
ning at the south side of the door, . . . *<going round the house>*,
ending at the north side of the door" (Sū. 7).[1]   If one believes
in an Aryan folk at all, it will be necessary to believe that these
ceremonial acts go back to a common basis.[2]

But support is possibly given to this theory for the development
of the pf. from the pairs *per-do, ven-do* with their passives *pereo,
veneo.*   Now, if these actives contain √ *dhē*, as is generally
supposed, we might expect a pass. in *-dhī-* (>*bī-*), and this
we actually have retained for us perhaps in a proverbial sentence
of Plautus, where we are supposed to have a form of *perbitere.*
Plautus's uses of this vb. are as follows: Rud. 495 utinam . . .
Malo cruciatu in Sicilia *perbiteres*; Pseud. 778 interminatus est
. . . Siquis non hodie munus misisset sibi Eum cras cruciatu
maxumo *perbitere.*   In the latter passage *perbitere* is plainly a
fut. infin. so far as the sense goes, and in the former the sense is
that of a plupf. subj.   This relation is precisely paralleled by *fore,
fores.*[3]   But one other passage remains to be discussed, Capt. 690
Qui per virtutem peritat non interit.   This is the MS reading, but
a *corrector recens,* whom Schoell takes to be Camerarius, has
written on the margin of B. *perbitat*; and Spengel, followed by
Brix, reads *perbitit,* while others have divided *perit at.*   In
Nonius's time the reading was supposed to represent *perire,* but
Osbernus reads *peritat* as indic. to *peritare.*   Of all the correc-
tions that have been proposed, *perbitat* involves the least change.
I propose to read the line: Qui per virtutem perbit at non interit.
This verse has all the look of a '*sententia,*' and may be much
older than Plautus.   A contextual motive for the change is close
at hand: cf. vs. 693 Vel te *interisse* vel *perisse* praedicat.   Plautus
is here unquestionably playing on the relation of *-do* and *-eo*;
contrast 694 Dum *pereas,* nihil *interdo*[4] dicant vivere with the

---

[1] This is Oldenberg's translation (S. B. E. XXIX, p. 248), but I am not sure
of the italicized passage.

[2] It would be going too far afield to seek completeness on this point.   The
meaning of *ignem supergradiebantur* is not easy to state.   Does it mean 'jumped
over the fire' or 'walked *round* it'?   In form *suffitio* must belong with *upa* +
√*dhā* 'put <wood> on <the fire>.'   The next sutra begins with *agnim
upasamādhāya* 'putting the fire in place.'

[3] For *.foret* as plupf. subj. I cite Bacch. 1047–8 ne ille edepol Ephesi multo
mavellem foret, | Dum salvos esset, quam revenisset domum 'I would prefer
his having stayed,' etc.; cf. also Mil.[2] 49 c. Brix's note, Trin. 832, 837; Truc.
89; Tibull. I 10, 11.

[4] Conjectural reading, but very probable; cf. Brix ad loc.

previous verse, and also vs. 683 Si ego hic *peribo*, si ille, ut dixit, non *redit* with vs. 696 Si ille huc *rebitet*,[1] etc. I cite as a warrant for the proverbial nature of this play on the words Epid. 74-6 Puppis *pereundast* probe | Quid istuc ad med attinet | Quo tu *interbitas* modo, where *interbitas* is R. Müller's correction for the unmetrical *intereas*. If we can assume that vs. 690 as I have given it was a maxim of long standing, we then reach a point from which we can explain *bito*, that utter *crux* in Latin etymology[2]: from *perbit at* the user of language got over to a *perbitat* of equivalent meaning with *pereat*. The parallelism of *perbitere* and *perbiteres* with *fore* and *fores* should make us see a fut. idea in the maxim, thus: 'if a man were to perish for virtue's sake, why that's no death.' In all the cases of *betere* (cited by Brix, Capt.[4] 380) only pres. subjs. in -*as*, etc., futs. in -*ēs*, etc., and, in addition to the fut. forms cited in the text (*perbitere*, *perbiteres*), the 1st sg. *rebito* (in a fut. condition) occur. It will thus be seen that the verb never strayed far from its original employment.

The case resolves to this: *fio*, *suffio* can be referred to √ *dhē* ; *fio* with a far better semasy than by the identification with √ *bhū*, while *suffio* shows too good a semasic concordance with *upa*+ √ *dhā*[2] to be inevitably referred to θύω.[3]

---

[1] Conjectural reading ; cf. Schoell ad loc.

[2] Latin varies between *bito* and *bēto*, which is in line with my explanation. The spelling *baeto*, for which there is very slight MS warrant, is only a palaeographic variant for *bēto*. There is no cogency whatever in comparing the Osc. word *baiteis* with *bito*, for its signification is utterly dark (cf. Bugge, KZ. XXII, p. 438 sq.).

[3] I am not sure but θύω can be brought into accord with √*dhē* ‖ *dhī*. The semasy for the sense 'sacrifice' has been exploited in the text. We have but to mention Lat. *pro-ficiscor* 'set out' to give early warrant for use as a verb of motion. For the three most immediate uses of √*dhē* 'put, set, make,' English shows plenty of phrases implying motion, and some of them rapid or hostile motion: 'make off, make forward, make at'; 'set out, set forward, set on'; 'put off <home>, put out,' etc.; the phrase 'then he *put out*' two persons rendered for me by *scooted* and *skedaddled*. It is not necessary to posit an Aryan √*sedo* 'go' (cf. Prellwitz, s. v. ὁδός), for this meaning can come from the sense 'set out' by decomposition. I note φροῦδος (<πρό+ ὁδός) 'clean gone' as a source from which the meaning may have got back to the simple root. Thus, in point of semasy ὁδός is subsequent to φροῦδος. In Latin *facio* never became a 'decomposite' to *proficiscor*. A word needs to be said on the phonetics. There can be no doubt of the vowel *u* having a connection with this root. Plautus gives ample warrant for *creduit*, Sk. *çrdd*+ √*dhā*, and *perduit* : Grk. πέρθω, Sk. √*spṛ-dh*, where we must recognize composition with

Support has been derived for *fio* : √ *bhū* from Celtic *bīu*, which Windisch referred in Curtius' Grundzüge to this root. Against this etymology Stokes declared himself in his review of this work. Meantime Osthoff (M. U. IV 16, Anm.) based on it an Italo-Celtic phonetic law. Zimmer (KZ. XXVI, p. 423) declared, with Stokes, for the equation with Lat. *vivo*, which Plautus uses as a stronger *sum* (cf. Brix, Trin.⁴ 390). Windisch (KZ. XXVII, p. 165) defends his view on the semasic ground that *bīu* never means 'live' in the full sense of the word, and on the phonetic ground that the Celtic correspondents of Lat. *vīvus* always show *ĭ*. The combination of these two objections makes an objection to his etymology. There was an Aryan variation *ĭ* in this word (cf. *vīvus* : βίος). What wonder if Celtic adapted this variation to varying uses! Stokes (KZ. XXVIII, p. 84) declares: "The forms belonging to this root often retain their original meaning 'to live,'" and maintains the tenet that *biuu* is a genuine representative of **bīvo* (<**gīvo*). Bartholomae (l. c., p. 190) brings into the argument the Ang.-Sax. forms, but these have no claim to being considered original. Gothic knows only *im, is, ist* in the sg., to which OHG. has made analogical forms *b-im, b-ist* (*b-is*), with retention of *ist*, while Anglo-Saxon has the forms *eom, eart, is*, and beside them *bēo, bist, biþ*. Analogy and syncretism have been very fully at work in the paradigm of the copulative verb. In *bist* the influence of the (Goth.) pret. *wast* and *waist* 'thou knowest' added a -*t*- to the first analogical form *bis*. In Ang.-Sax. 3d pers. *biþ* : 2d pers. *bist* we have to see nothing but analogy to *bindest, bindeþ*, or any regular verb. The 1st pers. *bēo*, 3d plur. *beoð* represent Aryan **bhevo, *bhevont-i.*[1]

√*dhē* (this by way of addition to my comparison in A. J. P. XIII, p. 480). Unexplained hitherto has been this vocalization. In Sk. *dhū-nu-te*, Grk. θύνω, and inferentially in Latin (cf. *danunt* : *dare*), we see that this group had the nasal inflexion. If we assume a primitive **dhī-no/u* to √*dhē* ‖ *dhī*, the change to **dhū-no/u* is explicable phonetically. These syllables produce 'rounding' by anticipation, and thus *ī* becomes *ū* (cf. Vietor, Germ. Pronunc.², p. 10). Anticipative rounding has also produced the 'velars' (Proc. A. P. A. 1894, p. ix). To this phonetic condition we can refer Grk. γυνά <Aryan **ĝenā* ‖ *ĝ*ʷ*enā*. I note further Sk. √*sā* ‖ *sī* 'bind' and Lat. *su-o* 'sew.' Sk. √*sīv* ‖ *syū* is a compromise form.

[1] Cf. v. Feierlinger in KZ. XXVII, p. 439 sq. His explanations of *bis* (2d sg.), *biþ* (3d sg.) as representatives of Aryan **bhvesi, *bhveti* are not based on the warrant of any actually occurring forms, and the explanation by analogy given in the text seems to me sufficiently strong without creating a *bis* as descendant of a primitive **bvis*, as an additional source for the analogy.

I sum up this argument by stating that Lat. *fit*, O.Ir. *bīth*, Ang.-Sax. *bĭð* are none of them referred with cogency to an Aryan **bhwīyet*, while the two first have just as credible connections with other roots, and thus this 'law' is based on altogether insufficient etymological material.

In Greek also √ *dhē* has become identified with a tense-voice-formation, the aor. and fut. pass. The passive voice is an accident of later adaptation. It is almost certain that the Aryans had reached no finite passive forms. They had, however, emphatic ('middle') forms in -*dh*-. In Greek there were doubtless other simple -*θ*-forms besides -*με*-*θα* and -*θι*, but the compound -*σθ*-forms prevailed after a conflict, of which -*με*-*σθα* shows traces. What wonder, then, if we find -*σθ*- beside -*θ*- in the aorist.[1]

Seeing so many cases of development of inflexion by composition with √ *dhē*, we must, it seems to me, return to the older explanation by which the weak German preterit was referred to this source. I take it that there are no insuperable phonetic objections in the way (cf. Brug., Gr. II, §907), and no other explanation gives so precise a correspondence of form as to equate Grk. -*θης* with Goth. 2d sg. -*dēs*. In the 1st sg. -*da* (<-*dhō*) corresponds precisely to Lat. -*bo*, and to this the 3d pers. -*da* was associated by the analogy of the strong preterit. But there was previously a 3d sg. **nasidēþ* which was also a 2d plur., for we are under no compunction to believe that the *nasida*-type was always past. So when this 2d plur. **nasidēþ* did receive past interpretation, it was extended to **nasideþ-uþ* > *nasid-ed-uþ*, thus: 3d sg. *nam* : 2d plur. *nem-uþ* = 3d sg. **nasīdeþ* : 2d plur. *nasid-ed-uþ*.

The greatest argument against connecting this weak preterit with √ *dhē* is the O.Ir. -*t* pret., but no valid objection can be made to regarding this pret. act. as just the equivalent of the pret. pass. in -*t*. In two persons it has the 'deponent' inflexion, and we

---

[1] Extremely neat is Henry's ἐ-γνώ-σ-θης = Sk. *á-jñā-s-thās* (Bull. Soc. Ling. VII, p. 29), but I have given reasons (supra, p. 3) for not showing any confidence in Grk. *θ* = Sk. *th*. For the *σ* of γνω-σ-τός I posit the demonstrative doublet *te* ‖ *ste*. Convincing proof of this can be given from the suffixes -*ter* ‖ -*ster* in Lat. *ven-ter* : Grk. γα-στήρ; cf. also Μέν-τωρ and Lat. *moni*TOR with *mon*-STR-*are*. The -*σθ*-aorists may be patterned on -*σμ*- of the pf., e. g. ἐ-γνω-σ-μαι, but I would base aor. and pf. both on the ptc. doublet. I note that the ptc. suffix -*ne* also had a by-form -*sne* (Brug., Gr. II, §66). We can refer to this suffix -*ste* the group of formations for which Aryan *tt* > *t̑t* has been assumed (Brug., Gr. I, §469).

shall see below that the 'deponent' is either act. or pass. at will; this suits the origin of the -*to*-suffix entirely (Part I, p. 416).

The Lithuanian impf. in -*davau* (Brug., Gr. II, §908) is perhaps also to be referred to this source. Perhaps the original 1st sg. was -*d-au*, whence, by doubling the ending, -*d-av-au*.[1]

THE ACC.-IMPV.—Sanskrit and Greek have a final -*m* that characterizes their impv. forms. I cite *d'uhám* 'let one milk,' δεῖξον 'show thou,' and Syrac. λάβον : Att. λαβέ. These are terminal accusatives, just like our English ' *home*,' which any dog understands to mean 'go home.' Thus *duhám* would mean 'to the milking.' The parallel group λαβέ ‖ λάβον is on the same footing as Sk. 'injunc.' *bharata* ‖ impv. ('mid.') *bharatām*, where -*tām* has the dithematic intention, as in 'subj.' *bharās* beside 'injunc.' *bharas*. In 3d dual -*ātām* theme and ending are both dithematic, and this dithematism characterizes the 2d and 3d dual of the entire 'middle.' We thus see that the -*m*-endings, as well as the -*dh*-endings, have come into play as inflective endings from the 'emphatic' impvs. Even thus there were not enough forms to go round, so we have in Sk. *bhavatām* not only a 3d sg. 'middle,' but a 3d dual act., and further a 3d dual 'middle' *bhávetām*, formed by adding the self-same ending to the monothematic 1st pers. *bha-ve* (not in use as an impv., but sufficiently attested by the ending in Grk. λῦ-σ-αι, Part I, p. 439). It seems hardly necessary to note that in Sk. 2d plur. -*dhva-m*, Grk. 2d dual σθο-ν, the -*m* is due to the impv. Likewise in Grk. 1st sg. mid. -ομην we have the same extension of 1st sg. act. -ομ that we have in Sk. 3d sg. middle -*atām* to 3d sg. injunc. -*at*.

THE 2D SG. PF. -*stha*.—For this ending also an agglutinative origin is to be sought. I take this to be the 2d sg. of √ *sta*[2] and to mean 'thou art.' Every one knows how frequently forms of Sk. √ *stha* are a mere copula[3] (cf. Böhtlingk, p. w., s. v. 11); the same semasy is vouched for by ἵστημι (cf. L. and Sc., s. v. B); in Latin *stare* is often little more than an emphatic copula (cf. Aen. II 639; III 210; VI 471, 652, 697), and is used almost like *fui* in making passives (e. g. ib. III 403 quin ubi transmissae *steterint* trans aequora classes), a use that is paralleled in Sk. (cf.

---

[1] In any case the ending -*au* is to be referred, like Gothic -*au*, Sk. -*āu*, to an Aryan *au* (Part I, p. 429).

[2] This, like *dhē*, is a 'demonstrative' root (supra, p. 2, f. n. 3).

[3] In modern Hindu dialects this development has gone on, and just as in Fr. *étais* to Lat. *stare*, the older sense is entirely lost.

Grassmann, Wört., s. v. 8, and Delbrück, SF. V, p. 407); in O.Ir. also this root has become a copulative verb (cf. Windisch, Gram., §386).

No phonetic objection can be made to taking this ending as -*st(h)a* instead of -*tha*. Historically it appears as -σθα in Grk., as -*st-ī* in Latin; these forms have been interpreted as analogical in Greek from roots ending in -*d*/*t*+*t(h)*, whence -σθ-; but to explain the Lat. form we have to resort to such forms as *diks-tī*. It were simpler to regard -*st*- as belonging to the primitive form, and this suits the conditions in Gothic better than the prevalent explanation. Thus the very important irregularities *waist, qast* (<*wait*+*st*, *qat-st*) are removed; forms like *skal-t* are thus explicable out of **skal-st*. In Indiranic the ending seems unquestionably -*tha*. I would suggest that this form arose out of the perf. **vaitstha*[1] (>Sk. *vet-tha*), but we must reckon with the possibility of an Aryan doublet -*ta* || -*sta* of probable demonstrative origin.

THE CONCEPTION OF VOICE in a developed stage, at least, could hardly have been present to the Aryans. An emphatic and a simple inflexion we can allow them (supra, p. 2), but the facts do not warrant us in going further than this statement, that endings in nasals just mentioned and developments from the emphatic forms in -*dh*- (supra, p. 4), along with 2d sg. -*sa* || -*sai*, 3d sg. -*ta* || -*tai*, may have begun to have a 'voice' value in the primitive period. Because both Greek and Sanskrit occasionally

---

[1] The question arises whether -*tst*- in Indiranic did not pass through the stage -*tpt*-, whence Sk. -*tth*- in *vet-tha*. It is known that the *kh* of modern India approximates to ṣ (Wh.[2] 61 *b*), and the question must be regarded as an open one whether the '*aspirates*' were not closer to the spirants than is generally supposed, for it seems possible to point the Vedic tradition in this way (Wh.[2] 37 *d*). In Sk. √*sthā* we can explain the *th* as similarly due to the reduplication *tiṣṭh*-, i. e. *sht* = ṣṭh. In line with this would fall Sk. *ṣaṣṭhá* 'sixth,' whence perhaps the Indiranic -*tha*- of ordinal formations. With the elimination of the -*ṣṭh*-cases the Sk. examples for -*th*- are much diminished. As a noun-forming suffix (Wh.[2], §1163) -*tha* may have arisen thus: *ukthd* 'saying' stands for Indiranic *uχtd*, with χt from *kt*, a phonetic change known in primitive Germanic, in Avestan, in Oscan and Umbrian, Celtic and primitive Slavic (Brug., Gr. I, §462). The ptc. *uk-td* would be a re-inforcement of the ptc. suffix from other sources, just as primitive Iranic *ft* falls back in Avestan to *pt* (Brug., Gr. I, §473, 1). Similarly *pṛṣṭhá* 'back' would fall under the phonetics of *tiṣṭhati* above. If we note the adv. suffix-doublet -*dā* || -*dhā* we need not look on the *th* of -*thā* as original, especially as we have the doublet *átha* || *ádha*.

attach the passive value to 'middle' forms, we cannot infer that this was an Aryan phenomenon, for Greek aorists in -ην ‖ -θην, as well as Lat. *fio*, show passive value with act. form, and in the Celtitalic passive we are only to see a development from the deponent; for the inflective characteristics develop from the same sources as the Sk. perf. act. (Part I, p. 432).[1]

THE NUMERALS.—In the three first numerals I see demonstrative stems. In *oi-* of the *unus*-group we have the 1st pers. interjection *ai* (Part I, p. 424); I compare the phrase 'Number One,' so often used in slangy English for the 1st person. In many children's games the counting-out formulas naively begin with the counter. In *du* of the 2d person we have the compound demonstrative *ta-wa* (Part I, p. 430),[2] or *da-wa*, with *da* used as in δεῦρο (supra, p. 3). Back of *tr-* of the 3d person lies *ta-ra*, meaning 'that one yonder,' with the ordinal *tṛ-tó* (likewise a compound demonstrative) preceding possibly the stem *tri-*.[3] Hopkins's explanation of **qe-tur* (A. J. P. XIII, pp. 85–6) as '(one) and three' seems to me very plausible. For **peṇ-qe* I abide by the old association with *finger*, and think that **pen* meant originally 'hand.' I compare πένης 'hand' (i. e. laborer), and, with *r(l)/n* inflexion, the syncretic Sk. form *pāṇi* 'hand.' We may

---

[1] I am but just made aware that Zimmer (KZ. XXX 224 sq.) has also made an explanation of this passive from the standpoint of a "3. plur. act. konjunkter Flexion auf *-ur* (**dicur*), von deren unpersönlichem Gebrauche die ganze Passivbildung ausgegangen sei" (Stolz², p. 361, Anm.). On the impersonal origin of the passive I refer also to my suggestion in A. J. P. XV, p. 221; and I cite here in addition from the first draft of this essay: "The middle of both Greek and Sanskrit verbs is also used as a pass. This I trace to the upgrowth of these forms from infinitives where the distinction of act. and pass. is obliterated. We find in the following Sk. sentence an explanation of the entire construction of so-called attraction with the infin. (Lat. gerundive): *ahám rudrāya dhánur ā tanomi brahmadviṣe çdrave hántavā u* (RV. X 125, 6) 'I stretch for Rudra the bow for his enemy, for the arrow and for slaying.' These are all dats. of purpose in a sense: it does not signify that we call *rudrāya* a dat. of advantage, or of ind. obj., *brahmadviṣe* a dat. of disadvantage, *çdrave* a dat. of agent, and *hántavāi* a dat. of purpose. The stretching of the bow fulfils a purpose for each of these objects. If we omit *çdrave* we may feel *brahmadviṣe hántavāi* as a pass., 'in order that his enemy may be slain,' or as an act., 'for him to slay his enemy.' It was this double act.-pass. potentiality that the impv.-infin. forms °*dhyāi* ‖ °*dhai* took into the new emphatic mood.

[2] I was in error in attributing this semasy for *two* to Benfey (Part I, p. 430) so far as I know, it is a new suggestion.

[3] We need hardly doubt that the primitive Aryan was capable, like the Hindu (cf. Wh.² 24 *a*), of confusing *ṛ* and *ri*.

also compare Eng. *fin* and *span* ('hand-stretch') : $\sqrt{s}>pen$ 'stretch' (cf. Brug., Gr. II, p. 136, Anm.), and possibly Lat. *penes*, for which a very convenient translation is 'in the hands of.' As to *six*, we have strong traces of a duodecimal system in Lat. *sescenties* 'six hundred' used as an indefinite number. If the F of $\sigma>F\acute{\epsilon}\xi$ (Aryan $s^{"}ak\check{s}$, cf. Pedersen, I. F. V 86) is parasitic (cf. the author, Proc. A. P. A. 1894, p. ix), I suggest that we have in Lat. *sex* a congener of *sequor*, which meant 'following,' the next number to 'five.' In *septem* we have perhaps an indirect extension of *sex*.[1] For the estimation of ὀκτώ we must consider ὄγδοος 'eighth.' I would see here in general a dual, as Fick does, but back of **oktāu* a more primitive **ok + dvāu*, with an actual '*two*' for the suffix. In the cardinals the previous ἑπτά has affected it, but in the ordinals ὄγδοος represents the more primitive condition, while ἕβδομος has been assimilated to ὄγδοος. For '*nine*' and '*ten*' I have nothing to add to the current view that ἐννέα possibly means 'one new one' (as an addition to eight), and that δέκα is connected with Aryan *dĕk ‖ dĭk* (supra, p. 5) and means 'receive with both hands.'

THE EMBRYOGENY OF ROOTS.—The agglutinative processes employed in an analysis of the inflexions bring us close to the embryogeny of the root. Thus $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$ has been explained as after all but a demonstrative, and it has been further assumed that many so-called roots in *-k* may contain, after all, a shorter root *+ke*. Thus Lat. *facio*, which goes back to $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$, has become in turn, to all intents and purposes, $\sqrt{fac}$. A demonstrative lies also, as I shall seek to prove, back of the substantive verb $\sqrt{es}$-, which indeed is to be explained as $\sqrt{e\text{-}s\text{-}}$. The Aryan 2d sg. is **e-si*, not **es-si*. In Latin *e-s* we have doubtless the earliest form ($<es$), before the *-v*-endings (Part I, p. 423) were developed. The various etymologies that have been proposed for the copulative assumed for it a weakened meaning out of something primitively more definite. In Hebrew the copulative verb is an adverb of a demonstrative value with verb-endings.[2]

---

[1] I note the English phrase 'at sixes and sevens.' Compare also the Lat. indefinite *sex septem* 'six or seven' (Hor. Ep. I 1, 58 and Ter. Eun. 332). Phonetically the relation of *sex* and *septem* cannot be bridged from our present standpoint, for we can hardly assume completed labialization of a 'velar' in the primitive period. I note, however, that Hillebrandt has made precisely this suggestion for Sanskrit phonology (BB. XIX 244-6).

[2] In Sanskrit the pronoun *aydm* is also used as a predicate without a verb (cf. Grassmann, Wort., s. v. *iddm*).

Any negro in the South verifies this condition, for his '*dar he*' means 'there he is.' Another element in the copulative verb is √ *stha*, which is, after all, probably only an enlargement of the demonstrative *sta*[1] which, as I have suggested above, is represented in the 2d pers. -*stha*. In Sk. *stha-s* 'you two are' we have a pluralization of 2d sg. (subsequently 2d plural) *stha-*. Aryan 3d sg. **esti* contains the root '*e*' plus this same -*st*. There was a parallel form **eti* (Sk. *áti*, Grk. ἔτι,[2] Lat. *et*) which was crowded out by **e-sti*. The semasic connection is sufficiently indicated by the term 'copulative' applied to Lat. *est* and to *et*. In Lat. *sum* for *s-om* 'this me' we are to see an earlier form than in Sk. *a-sm-i*. From the 2d sg. **e-si* the *e* worked, doubtless, first to *st'* (3d sg.) and thence to the 1st sg. Here it stopped in Sk., but in Grk. the *e-* was carried into the dual and plural also. Greek has forms that are entirely free from the -*s-*, e. g. εἰσί, Dor. ἐντί. But Greek also preserves a form ἐ-ν, e. g. in λ 414 περὶ δ' ἄλλοι ἑταῖροι | νωλεμέως κτείνοντο σύες ὡς ἀργιόδοντες | οἵ ῥα τ' ἐν ἀφνειοῦ ἀνδρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο, etc. Here ἐ-ν means 'belong to' and is not a preposition. Autenrieth, s. v. ἐν, specially notes that ἐστί, εἰσί, ἦν are often to be 'supplied' with it. For cases of ἐ-ν in the sg. I refer to ι 134–6 ἐν δ' ἄροσις λείη . . . ἐν δὲ λιμὴν εὔορμος. Not only was the form ἐν in existence, but also ἔνι, a pair like Lat. *est* ‖ ἐστί. It is well known how ἔνι is interpreted as ἔνεστι (cf. Autenrieth, s. v. fin., and L. and Sc., s. v. ἔνειμι II *b*). I cite from ι 126 οὐδ' ἄνδρες νηῶν ἔνι τέκτονες. This use of ἔνι persisted in Attic. Cf. Plat. Phaed. 77 E ἀλλ' ἴσως ἔνι τις καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν παῖς.

When we thus conceive of ἐ-ν as a form of the copulative verb, an easier explanation is possible for 3d sg. impf. ἦν as a reduplicated ἐ-ν. There is no reason, in the nature of things, why the *na*-ending (Part I, p. 432) should have been a plural rather than a sg. Still, we may explain this as a special Greek phenomenon that got its start from the idiom πάντα ἐστὶ = πάντα εἰσὶ.

Gothic also bears testimony to the root *e-* in its 1st sg. *i-m*, for it cannot be proved that this stands for **immi*, inasmuch as there is a question whether -*sm-*[3] in Gothic gave *mm* (cf. Osthoff, Perf., p. 428, Anm.).

---

[1] This has been previously suggested by Steinthal, as I am informed. In English *st* means clearly 'hush, there he is.'

[2] Homer also uses the form ἐτ' beside ἔτι, though we know how averse he was to the elision of -ι (cf. Kaegi, Gr. Gram.[2], §227, 8, Anm.).

[3] For this group in pronominal inflexion I think we must recognize a doublet -*sm-* ‖ -*m-*, on the basis of Lith. *támui*, O.Bulg. *tomu*, beside O.Pruss. *s-tesmu*;

In the Greek 2d sg. impf. ἦσθα I would see a syncretism of a 2d sg. *ē̆-s* plus a 2d sg. *stha* (supra, p. 16). A comparable syncretism is to be seen in Sk. *āsīs*. This I take to represent the 2d sg. *ās* (<Aryan *ēs*) plus a 2d sg. *īs* (<*ēs*, supra, p. 5). There seems to occur no inj. *asīs, but we are perhaps entitled to infer one from the Lat. fut. *erĭs*.[1] The comparison of *āsīs* with Lat. *erās* has been defended at length by Bartholomae (Stud. II, p. 63 sq.), but his *āi* ‖ *ā*/*ī* series is not convincing (supra, p. 10). I explain *erās* as a feminine verb-form (Part I, p. 438). We may, however, start from *brāvīs*, etc., injunctives, where in the termination -*īs* we may see a dithematic Aryan -*ēs* ‖ -*īs*. To this type may belong Lat. *velīs*.

Combining this explanation of √ *e-s* with the theory of the origin of the thematic vowel and vb.-endings (Part I, p. 413), we are able to take a form like Sk. *bharasi* and divide it *bhar-asi*, precisely equivalent to Eng. *thou art bearing*.

Other roots are perhaps also capable of ultimate analysis into demonstratives. Thus in Sk. *bhavasi* we may see *bhó+asi* ‘sir! thou art,’ which finally became a more emphatic copula ‘become.’ In *bho* we are to see a call, a monothematic vocative (supra, p. 421) to a stem *bhă*. It is not necessary, however, to reject a belief in an impv. *bha+wa*.

Roots of more pointed meaning may also be derived in the same way. I take for illustration the Lat. impv. *ce-do*. Its first part is infallibly a demonstrative, and we have no right[2] to separate this -*do* from the impv. ending -*dum* (supra, p. 2). From the mere call ‘hither’ the sense ‘hither with it,’ ‘bring here,’ ‘give here’ has developed. Now we can apply the same

and Lith. *tami*, O.Bulg. *tomǐ*, to Sk. *tásmin*, pronominal dats. and locs. If we bear in mind the frequency of 1st pers. demonstratives (Grk. ὅδε, Lat. *hǐc*, e. g.), it is not going far afield to institute a connection in Sk. between dat. sg. *asmāi* ‘to this <me>’ and *asmān* ‘us.’ Even if *asmān* go back to Aryan *n̥s+mans*, an unemphatic+an emphatic pluralization of acc. sg. *ma* (Part I, p. 419), we can assume that *n̥-smans* was the feeling for the form beside *n̥-s*, and that from this source the group -*sm*- got into pronominal inflexion. But -*m*- arose in the instrumental as an inflective element (Part I, p. 420). It is this we have in the O.Bulg. instrum. *těmǐ* and in the locs. cited for Lith. and Bulg., as well as in their dat.-abl. plural. In the fem. inflective element -*sy*- we are also to see an analogical extension: Sk. gen. sg. *ta-sy-ās* is only a feminine to masc. *ta-sy-a*, and from this source the infection spread.

[1] Cf. *erĭs* in Plautus (Trin. 971 ; cf. Brix, Einleit.⁴, p. 20).
[2] I have anticipated objections to this statement above, p. 2, f. n. 3 ; p. 16.

semasy to *bhara*, Grk. φέ-ρε: it was a call to a person, a vigorous 'you there!', which afterwards shifted to the sense 'bring here.' I especially note the post-Homeric adverbial φέρε 'come, well.' In Sanskrit, Greek and Latin the emphatic inflexion ('mid.' or 'pass.') means 'move rapidly.' While this sense is explicable from reflexive or passive collocations, it may derive along the lines of the interjection φέρε. I note that δεῦρο (supra, p. 3) in Homer connotes haste.

But *cedo* also means 'tell,' and thus vouches for the semasic development of the Aryan call (impv.) **sekwe* 'there you!'. This means 'say' in Grk. ἔν-νεπε, 'follow' in ἔπομαι, and 'see' in Ger. *sehen*. In English, per contra, the impv. 'say,' or 'say there!', comes to about the same thing as 'you there!', being a summons to attract the attention of a second person.

The Sk. root *skṛ* ‖ *kṛ* 'do, make,' with impv. *kara*, is made up, like *ce-do*, of two demonstratives *ka* + *ra*. Its semasy is similar to that of √ *dhē* (supra, p. 2). A certain interest attaches to the form *akat* (ÇB.; cf. Wh., Vb.-Roots, s. v. *kṛ*), which seems to be without the -*r*.

The same elements may be reversed. Thus, beside Lat. *ce-do* 'give' we have Greek δέ-κο-μαι 'receive,' while Lat. *doceo* 'show' is like *cedo* 'tell' in meaning, and Ionic δέκνυμι 'show'[1] tells the same story.

I turn to note some roots of equivalent meaning where the final demonstratives differ. I have shown above, p. 13, how Sk. *dhū* 'run' is a by-form of √ *dhē* ‖ *dhī*. There are besides in Sanskrit *dhāva-ti*[2] 'run,' which may be from *dhā* + *va*, *dhava-te* 'flow,' from *dhă* + *va*, *dhaná-yan* 'run,' from *dhă* + *na*, and *dhánva-ti* 'run,' from *dhă* + *nva*. Beside these we must set Grk. θρώσκω 'leap,' which implies a root **dher* 'run.'[3] Recalling the demonstrative

---

[1] Of extreme interest is the relation of δείκνυμι to this form. I note that δείκνυμαι 'greet' is compared with Sk. *dāçnati*, as to which Prellwitz (Etym. Wört., s. v. δείκνυμαι) says: " ει neben ε steht für altes ε̄, oder ε ist nur metrisch gedehnt." My own explanation of the vocalism is given above, p. 6. Now δείκνυμι may be explained in the same way, and to meet the case of Lat. *dīco* we must write the Aryan root as *dĕk* ‖ *dĭk*.

[2] Of interest is the second √*dhāv* 'rinse,' used in composition only with *ā*- and *ni*-. Its relation to √*dhē* is like that of Lat. *in-ficio* 'dye.' We need not interpret the -*v* as being any more a part of the root than the -*c* in the Latin word.

[3] Cf. Dunn in Class. Rev. VIII, p. 95. Here Sk. *dhārdyati* 'cause to run, urge on' is cited, but I cannot verify this meaning in the Petersburg dictionaries. I note, however, *dhāra* 'stream' ('run').

doublet *dha* ‖ *da*,[1] we shall not be inclined to separate from this group the roots *dr-am* ‖ *dr-ā* ‘run’ and *dru* ‘run.’ We may imagine that back of these lies a stem *da+ra*; *dr·am*[2] ‖ *dr-ā* are formations like *gam* ‖ *gā*, while *dravati* (: ‘√ *dru*’) stands in the same relation to √ *drā* as *dha-va-ti* to √ *dhā*. In the above forms, even if we limit ourselves to those in *dh*°, we can see the ORIGIN OF THE INTERCHANGE OF *r/n* in verb-roots, which must be entirely parallel to the same phenomenon in noun-inflexion.

Interesting formations under this head are the Sk. roots *vac* and *vad* ‘say.’ Back of these must lie impvs. **ve-kwe* and **ve-de*, with a meaning something like ‘you there!’. The developed meaning ‘say’ can be understood by our use of ‘*say*’ in the sense of ‘you there!’ (cf. also **se-kwe* above).

Sometimes it is the prior demonstrative that varies. Such a condition obtains in the Sk. roots *dhṛ*, *bhṛ*, *hṛ* (**ghṛ*), whose meanings ‘hold,’ ‘bear,’ ‘take’ lie very close together. For the two first we are prepared to recognize the demonstratives *dha* (supra, p. 2) and *bha* (supra, p. 21) at once. No demonstrative *gha* is known, unless we are to find it in Sk. *a-há-m*, the particles *ha*, *hí*, Lat. *h-ĭ-c*.

For certain reduplicating roots we may reach an even simpler origin, arising from the infant’s first unconscious utterances, to which a sense is given by the parents; typical for these is ‘*papa*’ ‖ ‘*appa*’; cf. Grk. πάππα ‖ ἄππα, ἄττα ‖ τάτα (τέττα),[3] names of the father. In Hebrew the same utterance is found as *abba*, and this consonantization we have in Lat. *aba-vus* ‘grandfather.’

[1] It seems to me that these initials *dh* ‖ *d* must have had a common origin. I suggest that in the Aryan period intervocalic -*d*- was pronounced with the previous syllable, and the following vowel was preceded by the glottal buzz as in German (cf. Vietor, Germ. Pronunc.[2], p. 57). Now *d*+ the glottal buzz (*d’*) is, according to Ellis (cited by Clark, Man. of Ling., p. 166), the Hindu pronunciation of the ‘aspirate’ *dh*. May we not assume that a primitive *da-dā-ti* became *dad’-ā-ti*? Or perhaps the aspirates were sonant spirants, and arose from sonants in intervocalic position, just as in the later Avestan and in Irish this same phenomenon took place. The extension of *d’* or δ from reduplicated syllables through the whole family of words would not then be a matter for surprise. The passing of all the ‘aspirates’ in Sk. sporadically into *h* is more easily explicable if their original value was that of spirants. I cite on *dh*° ‖ *d*° Noreen, Urgerm. Lautlehre, §51, Anm. 1.

[2] I note also √*bhr-am* ‘wander,’ which is possibly an extension of √*bhṛ* ‘move rapidly.’

[3] This vocalization shows the change of *a* to *ε* due to the consonantal environment (cf. Part I, p. 425).

Note Lat. *ata-vus* beside Grk. ἄττα. The same types are found in the word for 'mother'; thus beside *mama* we have Ger. *amme* 'nurse' and Lat. *ami-ta* 'aunt,' while in Sk. *am-ba* 'mother' the -*b*- comes from confusion with *abba*. Now, these utterances were interpreted also as calls for food, as in Lat. *mamma* 'breast,' and *papilla* 'breast,' diminutive to *pappa*, which, according to Nonius (cited in L. and Sh., s. v.) was the infant's word for food, or rather perhaps for drink (cf. *papilla*). The latter form was of wider employment: I note Pl. Epid. 727 novo liberto opus est *quod pappet*, 'something to eat.' If we transfer the same conditions to Aryan we can see a child's *papa* || *baba*, a call for something to drink or eat, back of Lat. *bibere*, Sk. *pibāmi*, Grk. πέπωκα. The word was of course afterwards worked up into a system. Its non-reduplicated kin we find in Lat. *pa-scere* 'feed,' Grk. πατέομαι 'eat,' Sk. √*pā* 'protect.' Doubtless πατήρ 'father' and Sk. *pa-ti* 'lord' belong here. The whole stock sprang from the loins of Aryan '*papa*.' The earlier linguisticians connected Lat. *māter* 'mother' with *mē-tior*[1] 'measure.' I would fain connect them both with *mama* || *amma*, and ἀμάω and *metere* 'reap' as well, for reaping was a primitive feminine employment.

Onomatopoetic words are of too common origin in our own time for any question to be raised as to their Aryan existence. I call attention to Vedic √*kṣu*, which is a very perfect example, if we can infer from modern to ancient sneezing. Grk. πτύω 'spit' is also a very perfect imitation of the act, and I am much inclined to doubt its derivation from *s)pyū*- (cf. Brug., Gr. I, §131). The onomatopoetic word was sometimes the name of the action, i. e. a noun, sometimes representative of the act, i. e.

---

[1] For the vocalization I refer to my general theory (Part I, p. 425); but I especially remark that no theory of phonetic law keeps us from re-uniting an Ionic η and a Doric ā in a primitive Greek ā. Now, there must have been a start in the primitive Greek period to this subsequent differentiation, for dialect is ultimately of the individual. So in the Aryan period original *a* and derived *e* may for a time have stood side by side. We may infer from the Sk. interchange of *r* and *l* (Wh.², §53 *b*) that this period was not necessarily a brief one. That adaptation of *a* to one meaning and of *e* to another resulted is a very natural supposition. The problem of individual dialect has been too much neglected. I have known more than one child that could not distinguish *pen* and *pin* in articulation. If we assign such a peculiarity to the mother of a family in a segregative population, it might in a few years affect numerous persons; and if later on a more gregarious habit brought the community closer together, we should have two contemporaneous pronunciations.

a verb.[1] I note the English *caw*, noun and verb: the same *motif* is expanded in Sk. *kāka*, Lat. *corvus*, Grk. κόραξ 'crow.'

There was another source of roots in what may be termed 'conventional onomatopoeia,' I mean especially the 'sound-roots.' These are characterized by the 'sonorous' letters *r* (*l*), *n*, *m*. I note cursorily for *r* the Sk. roots where it is initial only, √ *raṭ* 'howl,' √ *ran* 'ring,' √ *rap* 'chatter,' √ *rambh* 'roar,' √ *ras* 'roar,' √ *rā* 'bark,' √ *rās* 'roar,' √ *rī* 'flow,'[2] √ *riph* 'snarl,' √ *ribh* 'sing,' √ *ru* 'cry,' √ *rud* 'weep.' Bloomfield (IF. IV, p. 76) gives a brief list of Aryan sound-roots in -*n*,[3] and Persson (Lehre v. d. Wurzelerweiterung u. W.-variation, p. 69) gives a list of such roots in -*m*. The adaptability of these sounds to the formation of such roots lay in their capacity for continuous sonority, with *crescendo* and *decrescendo* effects to suit the 'gustiness' of sounds, as, e. g., of waterfalls or rapids.

I turn, in conclusion, to a brief glance at the deflected grade, i. e. *o* for *e*. Its home is in the verb. I have cast doubt upon its chief noun-occurrences above (Part I, p. 425), and the same explanation by infection is applicable to the -*ter*-/-*tor*- and -*en*-/-*on*-variations in nominal suffixes. It was the view of Grimm that -*oi*-, say, for -*ei*- had a semasic and not a phonetic origin. Extant accentual facts do not warrant us in explaining -*oi*- as 'post-accentual' (Part I, p. 414).[4] Possibly some acci-

---

[1] I refer to Mod. Lang. Notes, IX, col. 270, where I have found in the implosive 'click' sound of the tongue the *motif* lying back of the Aryan words for *tongue* and *lick*.

[2] I note RV. X 53, 8 *dçmanvatī rīyate* 'Stony-brook flows <noisily>.' Dean Byrn called attention in his 'Principles of the Structure of Language' to the occurrence of -*r*- in words for water.

[3] In a footnote on this passage Prof. Bloomfield notes the Sk. doublet √*svar* ‖ *svan* 'sound,' and he suggests the parallelism of *swen ‖ *swer* 'sun, light.' "Sound and light! The especial adaptiveness of the sound category is therefore perhaps not far removed psychologically from that of light, times and seasons." Language testifies very clearly to this in English 'loud' of colors, and we hear from many sides that trumpet-tones are 'red.' It is curious to note the Sk. 'color-roots' with initial *r*: √*raj* 'color,' √*ru-c* 'shine,' and *rudhird* 'red.' After all, the psychology may be as simple as the transfer of strong epithets from the objects of one sense to another: I note the phrase 'a howling swell.' Involved in this semasy is √*rāj* 'rule': compare βοὴν ἀγαθός ' good at a shout,' an epithet of a great warrior.

[4] Compare my readjustment of the accentual conditions in A. J. P. XIII, p. 479, but, after all, it is a readjustment. I note that Streitberg, following Kretschmer, regards the *o*/*e*-variation as not an accentual phenomenon (cf. IF. I, p. 90, footnote).

dental association started the type.   As to this I make the following suggestion: just as Sk. *diçáte* 'he points,' Grk. δίκνυμι ‖ δείκνυμι are referable to a root *děk* ‖ *dǐk* (supra, p. 22), so we might unite Sk. *vadati* 'he speaks' with Lat. *videre*, Grk. εἶδον 'see' with a root *věd* ‖ *vǐd*, back of which lies a demonstrative *ve+de* 'you there!' interpreted as 'look' or 'say.'[1] We may suppose that beside this was a *voi-da*, a still more passionate 'you there!', interpreted as 'look out'; even more acute was *voi+st'(a)*, with a last element like our English *hist!*[2]   When this complex was definitely understood as a call to the attention, an impv. *void+dhi* came into being, subsequently developed under accentual influence to **viddhi*; cf. Sk. *viddhi*, Grk. ἴσθι. In Sk. *viddhi* still means 'look out,' and Homer uses ἰδέ in this sense, while in tragedy ἰδού means 'lo!' or even 'hist!'. When **viddhi* was established as impv. 2d pers., then *voi+st'(a?)* was treated as 2d indic. and *voi+da* adapted to the other persons.   The passage of meaning from 'see' to 'know' lies through 'understand,' or a parenthetical 'I see,' and so οἶδα is used in Greek (cf. L. and Sc., s. v. **εἴδω* B. 7).[3]

The next step was the re-interpretation of the parenthetic 'I see,' i. e. 'perceive, understand, know,' as 'I have seen, perceived.' Thus the forms in **void°* became associated with the **věd-* ‖ *vǐd-* forms as 'perfects,' or 'intensives.' In Greek and Sanskrit intensive reduplication fell in to share in the creation of the new type, in Latin reduplication was seized on as the most characteristic thing, and in Gothic the vowel-change alone in the large majority of verbs.

It is venturesome, I am aware, to charge the whole 'perfect'-formation to a single association, as I have done.   But, after all, the Greek -κα-perfects, and possibly the Latin -*ui*[4]-perfects, are

[1] For this association of meaning I again bring in evidence Germ. *sehen* and Grk. ἔννεπε (supra, p. 22).

[2] Note Lat. *i)ste*, 2d and 3d pers.

[3] This use nearly comes up for οἶσθα in Homer (cf. A 365, ρ 573), but typical for Homer is O 204 οἶσθ ὡς πρεσβυτέροισιν ἐρινύες αἰὲν ἔπονται, and very frequently 'lo! how' would render the meaning perfectly well.

[4] This is a compromise type: Lat. *dedi* is a pf. middle = Sk. *dadé* (pr. or pf.). Latin may have had a form **dedau* = Sk. pf. *dadáu* (Part I, p. 429). The compromise would be **dedāvī*. This we have perhaps in *mandāvi* 'I have enjoined' (<**mǎnd⋅dāvi*). We need not operate with reduplicated forms, for we have the Umbrian form *subocau* = Lat. **subvocau*. For the spelling *subocauu*, Bréal's explanation (T. E. 70) as °*auw* represents precisely our English

types that must have proceeded from a like small beginning. The twelve Gothic preterit-presents never strayed far from *wait* 'I know' in meaning, being all an easy remove from 'know, know how, can.'[1]

Here I bring to an end these speculations as to the origin of roots and inflexions. Prehistoric and teleological problems are perhaps alike as to their insolubility, still a degree of certainty *is* reached for late Aryan forms by the comparative method. The elements of noun- and verb-inflexion have been deliminated and seen to partly coincide. By the assumption of primitive paratactic sentences I have sought to identify these coincident elements. This method has long been employed in the study of syntax, e. g. in the construction after verbs of fearing in Latin. From incompletely formed verbs like Grk. δεῦρο, plur. δεῦτε, '<come> hither,' Lat. *cedo*, plur. *cette*, 'hither' (>'bring here'), 'out with it' (>'say'), beside modern locutions, I have sought to lift the veil on the embryogeny of roots. The proper point of view for this task was given long ago by Lucretius:

> At varios linguae sonitus natura subegit
> Mittere, et utilitas expressit nomina rerum,
> Non alia longe ratione atque ipsa videtur
> Protrahere ad gestum pueros infantia linguae,
> Cum facit ut digito quae sint praesentia monstrent.
>   —De Rerum Nat. V 1026–30.

LEXINGTON, VA.   EDWIN W. FAY.

---

pronunciation of -*ow*. We may then explain Lat. *vocāvi* as **vocāu* affected by *dedī*. In *monui* of the 2d decl. we must see **mŏnĕ-vi*. The exceptions in -*ēvi* are all dissyllables save *delēvi*, which was probably felt as a compound, and *adolēvi*, a quadrisyllable, and so not affected by the accent.

[1] It is because I look upon this verb as ultimately the starting-point of the preterit inflexion that I believe we have in 2d sg. *waist* an original and not an analogical form (supra, p. 16).

II.—ON THE ETYMOLOGY OF THE TERM *Š'vâ*.

The term *Š'vâ* in Hebrew grammar is one of the *cruces lexico-graphorum* that has baffled all attempts at a satisfactory explanation. The word is spelled in four ways: שׁוה[2] שׁבא, שׁבה[1] and שׁוא. Of these forms the last is the usual one.

The spelling שׁבא or שׁבה can be traced to the very beginning of Hebrew grammar. It is found in the works of Saadyah Gaon's contemporaries Ben Asher,[3] the Karaite David Al-Fâsî[1] and Menaḥem b. Sarûq[1]; in the works of the latter's pupils,[4] in Ḥayyûj,[5] Ibn Janâḥ,[5] Ibn Barûn,[6] Ibn Balaam,[7] Judah ha-Levi,[8] Joseph Qimḥî,[9] Moses Qimḥi,[10] Moses Naqdân,[11] Zohar,[12] Elijah Levita,[13] Archevolti,[14] and elsewhere.[15]

Before entering on the discussion of its etymology, let us examine what this term properly denotes. In Hebrew there are two kinds of *Š'vâ*, the final *Š'vâ* and the initial *Š'vâ*. The final *Š'vâ* denotes absolute vowellessness, and is identical with the Arabic *sukûn*; while the initial *Š'vâ* is, to all intents and purposes, a vowel, differing from a full vowel only in that its pronunciation is rapid and indistinct. It is what the phoneticians call "a voice

---

[1] Pinsker, לקוטי קדמוניות, p. קס״ה; מחברת מנחם, p. 16ᵃᵇ.
[2] Dunasch, Kritik, ed. Schroeter, Nos. 108, 120.
[3] Massorah, ed. Ginsburg, I 656ᵃ.
[4] תשובות תלמידי מנחם, p. 49.
[5] Bacher, Abr. Ibn Esra als Gramm., p. 64, n. 17.
[6] כתאב אלמואזנה, p. 12.
[7] הוריית הקורא; cf. Porgès, Rev. d. Études Juives, XXIII 311.
[8] Kusari, II, §80.
[9] ס׳ הזכרון, p. 18; ס׳ הגלוי, p. 62.
[10] Bacher, loc. cit.
[11] דרכי הנקוד והנגינה, ed. Frensdorf, passim.
[12] I 24ᵇ.
[13] I do not recollect the place.
[14] ערוגת הבשם, ed. princ., p. יח.
[15] Massorah, ed. Ginsburg, III 23ᵃ, 27ᵇ, 28ᵇ, 37ᵃ, 38ᵃ and elsewhere.

murmur without any definite configuration"[1]; in German, *Mur-melvocal.*[2]

As the nature of initial *š°vâ* is not infrequently misunderstood, it will not be out of place to cite here the testimony of ancient authorities on the subject. The old versions of the Bible render initial *š°vâ* by a full vowel; e. g. Σολομῶν, Σαμουήλ, for the Hebrew שְׁלֹמֹה, שְׁמוּאֵל. To the vocalic nature of initial *š°vâ* testify Ben Asher,[3] Saadyah Gaon,[4] Hayyûj,[5] David Qimḥi,[6] the anonymous works שקל הקודש,[7] and 'Manuel du Lecteur' (מחברת התיגאן),[8] Sol. Almoli,[9] Elijah Levita,[10] Emmanuel Bonevento,[11] and others.[12]

According to Joseph Qimḥi, *š°vâ* with *ga'yâ* is pronounced like *â*.[13] In medieval MSS and vocalized prints *š°vâ* is frequently found for a full vowel.[14] The Lithuanian and other Jews pro-

---

[1] Sweet, Handbook of Phonetics, p. 187.

[2] Sievers, Grundzüge der Phonetik⁴, §§263, 264.

[3] דקדוקי הטעמים, ed. Baer and Strack, §14.

[4] Bacher, Gramm. Termin., p. 1119, n. 2, end; Harkavy, Leben u. Werke des Saadyah Gaon, p. ס״נ, n. 10.

[5] Bacher, ib.

[6] מכלול, chapt. on *š°vâ*.

[7] Page 5: ובלשונם ההמוני (ר"ל הערבי) יש להם בהבדל התנועות הקרובות במבטא הרגש ניכר רצוני כי הם מבדילים בין התנועה אשר היא אצלם במדרנת הצרי אצלנו ובין התנועה אשר היא במדרגת הסגול וכל שכן בין שתי אלו ובין השוא ולא כן אנחנו עושים בארצות האל ... ואין לנו הרגש בהבדל אלו השלש תנועות במבטא רצוני בין הצרי והסגול והשוא *in Arabic they make a clear distinction between similar vowel-sounds; e. g. they distinguish between the sound corresponding to our* צרי *and between that corresponding to* סגול, *and those two are distinguished from* שוא. *We, however, in these countries make no distinction in the pronunciation of the three vowels* צרי, סגול *and* שוא.

[8] Journ. Asiat. 1870, p. 372: כמו בי בראשית נקרא השוא בפתחה ואינה נמשכת כדי שתחסבול טעם אלא מתגלגלת ודולנת למלך הסמוך לה *as in the* ב *of* בראשית, *the* שוא *is pronounced like a* פתח, *only that its tone is not long enough to receive the accent, but the voice rolls over it and hurries on to the following vowel.*

[9] רוב, p. 62: משפטי הלשון העברית, cited by Gordon in his הליכות שוא העולם קוראים כל שוא נע שבעולם כמו סגול או צרי וקצת קוראים כל שוא נע פתח *most people pronounce all vocal š°vâ's like* סגול *or* צרי; *but some people pronounce all vocal š°vâ's like* פתח.

[10] I do not recollect the place.

[11] וקריאתו (של השוא) בשלשה אופנים והסימן פק"ח, ר"ל פתח, לוית חן, p. יכד: פתח, *adjoining vowel* קריאת האות, חירק *the pronunciation of š°vâ is of three kinds:* חירק (?), *vowel* חירק.

[12] Massorah, ed. Ginsburg, III 49 ff.

[13] ס׳ זכרון, p. 8 ff.

[14] Saadyah Gaon, אגרון, ed. Harkavy, in op. cit., p. נ"ו: נָהֲרוּ=נְהָרוּ, p. נ"ז: or רְבִּי=רְבִּי; שְׁנִי=שֵׁנִי, passim, מקנה אברם, de Balmes; מְהֻשְׁלֹש=מָהֻשְׁלֹש; רְבִּי (=רְבִּי).

nounce initial *š*vâ* even to-day like צְרִי,[1] while the Jews in Yemen pronounce it like פתח.[2]

To this pronunciation of initial *š*vâ* is due a fact which has hitherto remained unexplained. I mean the insertion of the *mater lectionis* י after vocal *š*vâ* in the Talmud and in medieval writings. If the Talmudic orthography, as we have it at present, goes back to the fifth century, we obtain an important link in the chain of evidence between the old versions and the testimony of Ben Asher, showing that the vocalic nature of initial *š*vâ* was recognized not only in Palestine, but also in Babylon. It only differed from a full vowel in that it could never receive the word-accent, but could receive *ga'yâ*, i. e. the secondary accent. It could also influence the metre in poetry, and was taken in consideration by the accentuators of the Biblical texts.

Such being the case, the question now arises, could the term *š*vâ*, if it were devised by the Hebrew grammarians, have originally denoted both heterogeneous kinds of *š*vâ*? From the fact that the Massorites adopted one sign for both kinds of *š*vâ*, it would follow that they also gave that sign, or what it stands for, a common name.

They could have been led to give both kinds a common sign, either because they considered them identical—which supposition would contradict the historical evidence adduced above; or, while being conscious of their difference, detected a characteristic common to both kinds. Such a common characteristic could only be the rapidity of pronunciation; hence a common name must express this characteristic. They followed exactly such a course with regard to the two vowels *ŏ* and *ā*, giving them a common sign and a common name expressing their common characteristic, viz. קמץ.

Against this view may be urged that it is also conceivable that the Massorites expressed in this name not the common quality of both kinds of *š*vâ*, but the figure of the adopted sign. This is conceivable, but highly improbable in itself, and impossible for the reason given below. If now we examine the various terms used as synonyms of *š*vâ*, שְׁתֵּי נְקוּדוֹת, חָטֵף, רָפֶה, we cannot help seeing that the only name that would express the common characteristic spoken of is חָטֵף *hastening*, or, in its Hebrew form, חָטוּף *hastened* or *hastening* (the form *qātûl* in later Hebrew may

---

[1] Cf. Hirschfeld, ZDMG. 48, 706.   [2] Jacob Saphir, אבן ספיר, I 55ª.

have both meanings). On the term רָפֶה or רָפִי compare Geiger[1]
and Pinsker.[2] שתי נקורות corresponds to the Syriac term זוגא, a
synonym of שויא, referring to the form of the sign. *Š°vâ* is
evidently a later name, and its meaning must depend upon its
original orthography.[3]

Before discussing this last point, let us make a digression to
examine the corresponding Arabic term *sukûn*.

In Arabic there is only one kind of *š°vâ*, the final *š°vâ*. Its
name is *sukûn*, meaning *rest*. This term is intelligible only when
we consider it as meant to be in contradistinction to *hárake*
'motion,' by which name the Arabs designate the vowel. They
call the vowel *motion* because the vowel is the essential element
of vocal utterance, which causes the organs of speech to move.[4]
Without reference to the motion of the vowel-sound, the term
rest for vowellessness could never have arisen. The Hebrew
name for vowel is תְּנוּעָה, which means the same as its Arabic
equivalent *hárake* 'motion.'

Now, one of three cases is possible to explain the identity of
terms in different languages. Either both were influenced by a
common source, or both hit upon the same expression in conse-
quence of a similar association of ideas, or the one borrowed from
the other. We know of no common source from which both
could have derived the term. That both should have hit upon
so strange and fanciful a term in consequence of a similar asso-
ciation of ideas is not likely. We know, moreover, as a matter
of fact, that the rise of grammatical studies among the Jews was
due to the impulse given by the Arabs.[5] The first grammarian
to use the term תנועה seems to have been Moses Ibn Chiquitilla.[6]
His predecessor, Menahem b. Sarûq, paraphrases the same idea

[1] ZDMG. XIV 318.

[2] Einleit. in d. babyl.-hebr. Punktationssystem, pp. 7, 176–8.

[3] Freytag, in his Hebr. Gram., p. 25, n., erroneously assumes that חטף meant
originally only vocal *š°vâ*.

[4] Brücke, in his Grundz. d. Physiol. . . . d. Sprachlaute[2], pp. 134–5, explains
the term *hárake* differently: "Der erste Schritt zum Verständnisse ist, zu
bemerken, dass die Vocalzeichen . . . im Sinne der Araber etwas ganz anderes
sind als unsere Vocalzeichen. Die letzteren bezeichnen die Stellung, in der
der Vocal tönt, die ersteren aber den Uebergang in diese Stellung, darum
heisst auch der Vocal bei den Arabern Bewegung."

[5] Cf. Harkavy, Leben u. Werke, etc., p. לּ"ז ; Bacher, Die hebr. Sprachwiss.,
pp. 13–15.

[6] On the spelling of this name, cf. Jellinek, Sabbathblatt, 1844, pp. 140, 156
cited by Posnañsky, Frankel's Monatsschrift, 38, 382.

in different ways, but of the term תנועה he is ignorant.[1]　The Arabs did not borrow from Ibn Chiquitilla.　The only possibility, then, remains that the Jews borrowed the term from the Arabs.

From the fact that תנועה is the only name for vowel found in Hebrew,[2] and from the fact that this name has been proven to be a translation from the Arabic, it follows that the Massorites in pre-Arabic times, while having names for the separate vowels, had not yet risen to the general notion of vowel, and hence could not have invented a term equivalent to the Arabic *sukûn* 'vowel-lessness,' the correlate of vowel.

We may now proceed to review the various etymologies that have been suggested for the term *š*ʷâ*.

Assuming the correct spelling to be שוא or שוה, Abraham Ibn Ezra, referring to the name for vowel meaning *motion*, explains the names of all the vowels to denote the different modes of motion of the heavenly spheres.　*Š*ʷâ* in his opinion would mean *evenness*, and symbolize the even motion of the upper sphere.[3] Nowadays this opinion needs no refutation.　Benjamin ben Judah explains it to mean *equal*, i. e. indifferent, wanting a certain, definite sound.[4]　Süsskind ben Zanwil translates it *equalizer*, its function being, in his opinion, to equalize or balance the weights of the vowels.[5]　This is not very clear.　Bonevento,[6] Hanau[7] and

---

[1] Bacher, Grammat. Terminol., p. 1117, n. 2.

[2] On the Massoretic term דגש, cf. Pinsker, Einl., loc. cit.; the term נקודה is later and means only *vowel-sign*.

[3] Cf. Bacher, Ibn Esra, pp. 62 n. 3, 64.

[4] השוא נגזר מלשון שוה כלומר שהאות שוה ואין בה תנועה ‏:מבוא הדקדוק *š*ʷâ is derived from* שָׁוֶה, *i. e. the consonant is indifferent, has no special vowel-sound;* cf. also Bacher, RÉJ. X 133.

[5] וצורתו שתי נקודות זה על גב זה להשוות משקלי התנושות ‏:יג. p. ,דרך הקודש ‏ושמו מורה על מהותו לשון השואה *its form is made up of two perpendicular points, which serve to equalize the forms of the words, and its name denotes its essence, as it means 'equalizing.'*

[6] ומכל תנועה ותנועה יבנה בית ... אך בשוא שוא עמלו בוניו בו ‏:יכד. p. ,לוית חן *by means of any vowel a syllable can be formed; but this is not the case with* שוא.

[7] והנה קבלתי מאדוני אבי ז"ל שמונה בחכמת המוזיקא ‏:יח. p. ,בנין שלמה שבעה מדרגות הקולות ... והברת הקול אשר איננו הולך אחרי עקבות מדרנות האלה נקרא קול שוא ותפל ... על כן נראה לי ששוא נקרא כן מפני ... והנה השוא אינו הולך אחרי עקבות המש הגדולות ולא אחרי עקבות המש הקטנות בהברתו ‏שוא נקרא לכן ... ותפל שוא קולו כ"א א"י והנה *I have it from my deceased father, of blessed memory, that there are seven tones in the musical scale ... and any tone not in harmony with one of those seven tones is called a discord ... Now, it seems to me that because š*ʷâ does not follow in its pronunciation any of the five long or of the five short vowels, therefore it has been called* שָׁוְא, *i. e.* שָׁוְא *nothingness.*

others connect it with שָׁוְא *nothingness.* Gesenius[1] offers two
explanations. The one he prefers is that it means *sistens vocem*,
from a Syriac stem שוי. He compares with it the Arabic *waqf*,
but the latter means *pause.* The other suggestion, adopted by
Luzzatto[2] and Nestle,[3] is that it is connected with the Syriac term
שְׁוַיָּא, which has the same sign, a double point, and is equivalent
to a semicolon or comma. Now, if the Massorites had adopted
this Syriac term, it is difficult to see why they should not have
retained the same form of word as in Syriac. The term שְׁוַיָּא is
the plural of the adjective שַׁוְא, corresponding to Hebrew שָׁוֶה.
The plural is used here for the dual, which is wanting in Syriac,
and means *two equal dots,* i. e. two dots lying in a perpendicular
line, not in a slanting position. The form שוא is not the plural;
nor is it the singular to that plural.

Professor Paul Haupt thinks that שוא, if it be connected with
שָׁוְא, may have the sense of *transitoriness* or *fleetness,* like its
synonym הֶבֶל, and would thus be equivalent to חֶטֶף.

Against the assumption of an original form שְׁוָא there are two
objections. In the first place, unless we adopt the derivation
from שָׁוְא, the form is very strange. There is, to my knowledge,
no parallel form of a ל״ה stem; and nobody ever attempted to
explain it.

The second objection is the gratuitous assumption of the
change of ו to ב. It is inconceivable that, if the original spelling
be שוא, a form suggestive and full of meaning, the earliest
authorities should have misspelled it שבא, a form which has been
meaningless to us for over a thousand years. This would be
even stranger, since there is hardly a parallel for the change of
ו to ב, although the opposite does occur.[4]

Assuming the spelling שבא to be original, the following
etymologies have been suggested.

Süsskind b. Zanwil[5] connects it with the verb ישב; but the
meaning he attaches to the word נתישבה is not quite clear to me.

[1] Lehrg., p. 64.
[2] אגרות שד״ל, p. 331.
[3] Syriac Grammar (1889), p. 17.
[4] פרבר for פרור, Arab. שרבין, Aram. שורבינא for Assyr. *šurmenu, šurvenu*
(ZA. II 268), have no bearing on the question. They are various attempts to
render a foreign word, and to speak in such cases of a change of *w* to *b* is not
quite correct.
[5] דרך הקודש, p. יג: שעליה הטעם מן בן גם הוא שבא לו קוראים ואשר
נתישבה התנועה שלפניה או שלאחריה ויהיה... מנביל כל תנועה השייך לו כמו
כל סוף פסוק שיש לו שתי נקודות זה על גב זה כמוהו להורות גבול הפסוק ההוא

He compares the function of the *š°vâ* with regard to the vowels
to the function of *sôph pasûq* with regard to the verse. This had
already suggested itself to earlier grammarians on account of the
similarity of the signs. Thus, de Balmes defines *š°vâ* to be
גְבוּל תנועה.[1] Ewald[2] explained the word to be an apocopated
form of שָׁבָת *rest*. Stade[3] adopted Ewald's opinion, and cites as
an example of the unusual apocope of a radical ת the Aramaic
forms שׁוּבָּא ,שַׁבָּא, which are shortened from original שַׁבְּתָא ,שׁוּבְּתָא
(primarily שַׁבַּתָּא). But those forms are due to erroneous analogy.
The Syrians, with whom שבתא was a borrowed word, took the
last syllable תא to be the feminine ending of the emphatic state,
which in part it probably is, and thus derived from it an absolute
שַׁבָּא. A similar process is seen in בֵּ' for בֵּיתָא.

Sol. Deutsch[4] sees in it the Aramaic שִׁיבָּא *fissure*, *gap*, i. e. bare
of vowel. Professor Haupt would explain the word as *chip* or
fragment (of a vowel), i. e. reduced vowel.[5]

It seems that Gesenius and Ewald, seeking in the word the
meaning of *sukûn*, are right, although we cannot agree with their
etymologies. I should derive the term from יׁשב *to sit, dwell, rest*.
The form as it has been handed down to us may be explained as
the imperative singular masculine שְׁבָה, and would mean *stop!
hold!* This is probable on the basis of Derenbourg's theory
that the names of the vowels come from the directing words or
motions of the school-teacher while instructing children.

A somewhat similar use of the imperative as a noun we find in
the Talmud. The imperative עֲשֵׂה *do* is used in the sense of a
positive precept. This expression is shortened from מִצְוַת עֲשֵׂה,
and later writers form a plural עֲשִׂין. The opposite of עֲשֵׂה is שֵׁב
sit, in the phrase שֵׁב וְאַל תַּעֲשֶׂה. We find here שֵׁב, the imperative
of יׁשב, used in almost a nominal sense.

It is, however, more probable that it was originally an infinitive

---

the reason why people call it שבא *with* ב *is because the vowel preceding or following
it has settled* (?) *on it . . . and it limits the adjoining vowel, just as* sôph pasûq,
which has the same form, limits the verse.

[1] מקנה אברם, pp. 33, 36.
[2] Lehrb. d. hebr. Sprache, 5th ed., p. 122, n. 1.
[3] Hebr. Gram., p. 40.
[4] Hebr. Gram., p. 7.
[5] Cf. שְׁבָבִים, Hos. 8, 6 (Nöld., Mand. Gramm., p. 140, §119); Mand. שׁאבוּניא
splinter, sliver, chip; Wellhausen, Kleine Propheten², p. 118. Arab. *sabba* is a
synonym of *qḍṭa'a*.

form שֵׁבָה[1] or שְׁבָה*. The first occurs in the Bible, the other is formed by analogy of such forms as עֵצָה ,רֵעָה ,לֵדָה. This would be a direct translation of *sukûn*. The form שְׁבָה or שֵׁבָה was then simplified to שְׁבָה, in order that the term might begin with the sign it denotes, just as פַּתַּח ,צְרִי ,סְגוֹל, etc., were changed to סֶגוֹל, פֶּתַח ,צֵרִי[2]. Popular etymology then connected it with שָׁוְא and changed its name to שְׁוָא, which took the popular fancy and became the dominant spelling.

Professor Haupt, to whom I am indebted for part of my references in this paper, has called my attention to a statement of König,[3] that the spelling שבא occurs neither in the Massorah, nor in any grammarian previous to Elijah Levita, whose date is 1469–1549. I find that Gross, in his work on Menahem b. Sarûq, makes the somewhat similar statement that the spelling שבא is found nowhere except in Sarûq. I have proved above that this spelling can be traced to Ben Asher and David Al-Fâsî, contemporaries of the first Hebrew grammarian Saadyah Gaon. From the fact that the earliest authorities spell promiscuously שבא, שבה, שוא, שוה, we see that the term is an old and familiar one. In the 'Massorah,' ed. Ginsburg, I have found שבא as well as שוא. To be sure, the notes in which שבא occurs are evidently of a late date, but so are those having שוא.

But even if the statement of Gross and of König should turn out to be correct, that only שוא occurs in the Massorah, this would only show that the Massorites preferred the popular etymology. They may not have understood the form שבא. It must be borne in mind that the Massorites were either copyists of the Bible or Hebrew school-teachers by occupation. Their mother-tongue was not Arabic, but Aramaic. From the nature of their occupation they came but little in contact with Arabic life, and even less with their literature. Hâya Gaon speaks of Aramaic as a living tongue in the eleventh century.[4] The term may have been

---

[1] Of course שיבתו (2 S. 19, 33) must be a transcriptional error (for שִׁבְתּוֹ); but this could not have influenced the Massorites.

[2] Cf. Stade, §35ᵃ, note.

[3] Lehrgeb., p. 44.

[4] תשובות הגאונים, ed. Harkavy, §§205, 405. Dalman, in his Gram. d. jüd.-pal. Aram., p. 33, states that the Arabic supplanted the Aramaic about 800. He concludes this from the fact that since that time Jewish works began to appear written in Arabic, and from the expression *lughe abâ'inâ* used by Saadya Gaon with reference to the Aramaic. In the face of Hâya Gaon's

introduced by one familiar with Arabic literature, but was not understood by the majority of the Massorites, and therefore changed to שׁוא.

It may, however, be urged that a word from the stem שׁבן, שׁבת or נוח would have been more appropriate as a translation of *sukûn*. Admitting this, we can only regret the lack of skill in the translator.[1] Besides, those familiar with early Hebrew literature well know how freely the writers of that period handled the Hebrew, especially as regards the use of synonyms. Thus, e. g., the Arabic term *sâkin* is rendered by שׁוֹקֵט, חוֹנֶה, שׁוֹכֵן, נָח. Dunaš uses הַנָּפָה for הַנָּעָה.[2] The Karaite Aaron b. Elijah of Nicomedia[3] uses the expression שׁוֹכֵן נֶפֶשׁ for the standing Rabbinic phrase מְיוּשָׁב בְּדַעַת *of a settled mind.*

But the strongest support of my theory I find in a passage from Sarûq. He says[4]: כל האותיות טעונות דגש ורפה לצחצח הלשון כפי הנתתם בפה ומושבן בלשון *to give proper elegance to the language, the consonants must be either hard or soft, accordingly as they are vocalized or not vocalized by the organs of speech,* lit. *according as they are moved by the mouth or left at rest by the tongue.* It is clear that מושב is the opposite of הנעה, just as רפה is the opposite of דגש. In other words, מושב means the pronunciation without a vowel—with שבא. The term מושב is related to שבא as הנעה is to תנועה.

Summing up what has been said above, we come to the following conclusions:

(1) The original indigenous name for both kinds of š'vâ was in Aramaic חָטֹף, in Hebrew חָטוּף.

(2) Massoretic notes employing this term, or the earlier expression רְפֶה, antedate the Arabic period.

(3) The term š'vâ was originally spelled שִׁיבָה or שְׁבָה; it is a translation of the Arabic *sukûn*, and meant only final š'vâ.

(4) The vocalization of the word was changed to שֵׁבָה in order that the first syllable might contain the vowel which it denotes.

---

statement, we would say that Arabic became the literary language without forcing the Aramaic out of every-day use. Saadya's expression may, moreover, have reference to his native country, Egypt, not to Babylon.

[1] A modern writer translates *literae liquidae* by אותיות לחות (!) in Hebrew (Tedeschi, Thesaurus Synon., p. 6).

[2] Kritik, ed. Schroeter, p. 48.

[3] גן עדן, p. יצד: וצריך להיות המעיין שוכן נפש *and the student must be clear-minded.*

[4] מחברת מנחם, p. 6.

(5) The form שְׁבָא is the Aramaicized spelling for שְׁבָה.

(6) After its meaning had become obscure, popular etymology connected it with שָׁוְא, and the spelling שוא came in vogue.

(7) In consequence of that popular etymology, שוא came to be applied to both kinds of *s'vâ*.

(8) The first grammarians, wishing to be more correct, restored the original spelling שבה, but had to submit to the current use of the term for both kinds of *s'vâ*.

<div style="text-align: right">C. LEVIAS.</div>

III.—ΚΙΣΣΟΣ AND *HEDERA*.

"Warum stellt man diese beiden Wörter nicht zusammen," asked Windisch (in Curtius Stud. VII, p. 184), deriving κισσός from *κιθϳος, just as μέσσος from *μεθϳος, Idg. *medh-ϳo-, and comparing, for the *r*-suffix in *hedera*, the form κίσσαρος (= κισσός) used by Hippokrates ap. Erot., p. 208.

κισσός and *hedera* are both probably to be derived from the Idg. √ ǥhedh- (beside which there is a parallel form √ ǥhed-)[1] 'to cling,' from which come many other derivatives, e. g.

Aryan. Skr. *pari-gadhita* 'clasped, embraced,' from √ ǥhedh-.

Greek. χανδάνω, fut. χείσομαι (from *χεντσομαι from *χενδ-σομαι), aor. χαδεῖν (from *χη̥δ), from √ ǥhed-.

Italic. `Lat. *pre-hendō, praeda* (from *prae-hedā), from either √ ǥhedh- or √ ǥhed-.

Germanic. Goth. *bi-git-an* 'to find, get'; AS. *gitan*, Engl. *get*, from √ ǥhed-.

Before passing on to the main object of the present paper—namely, the explanation of the difficult ι in κισσός—it may be well to examine the suffix or suffixes contained in κισσός and *hedera*, a question which hitherto has received but little attention from the comparative point of view.

On phonetic grounds there is nothing to hinder the derivation of κισσός from *κιθ-σο-ς from *κεθ-σο-ς from Idg. *ǥhedh-so-s, and indeed this is what Fick, Vergl. Wörterb. (1890), p. 415, would seem to imply, when he derives κίσσα (*sic*) 'ivy' from *χιθ-σα from *ǥhedh-sā[2]; similarly we may derive *hedera* from *hed-esā from

---

[1] Compare Grassmann in Kuhn's Zeitschr. XII 128, who holds that -*dh*- and -*d*- in this root are merely parallel root-determinatives; Vaniček, Etymologisches Wörterb. (1877), p. 239; Whitney, Sanskrit Roots (1885), p. 34; Brugmann, Grundr. I, §425; II, §§627, 628, 631; Fick, Vergl. Wörterb. (1890), pp. 39, 195, 414, 415.

[2] Surely Fick is making a mistake in writing κίσσα here instead of κισσός. κισσός is the Greek word for 'ivy,' whereas κίσσα means (i) a chattering, greedy bird, perhaps the jay, and (ii) the longing of pregnant women, a false appetite, a craving for strange food; and from κίσσα (ii) comes κισσάω. The older form of κίσσα 'jay' is κείσσα, as is clear from the Hesychian gloss κείσσα· κίσσα. Λάκωνες. The ει is contracted to ι before the double consonant, as in τρισκαί-

Idg. *ₔhedh-esā*. We should thus have two ablaut-forms of the same suffix. But there is, in so far as I am aware, no evidence for an Idg. formative suffix *-so- -eso-* (v. Brugmann, Grundr., Index, pp. 190 sqq.); hence this derivation can hardly stand.

It is best, with Windisch, to derive κισσός from *κιθ-ῐο-ς from *κεθ-ῐο-ς from Idg. *ₔhedh-ῐo-s[1]; Windisch is herein followed by Walter in Kuhn's Zeitschr. XII, p. 386, note[2]; King and Cookson,

δεκα for τρεισ-και-δεκα (Fick in Bezz. Beitr. I (1877), p. 173; but v. also Brugmann, Gr. II, §175, 1, on the form τρισκαίδεκα). Fick (Bezz. Beitr., l. c.) derives κεῖσσα from *κειθ-ῐα from *χειθ-ῐα, which last, he says, agrees perfectly with Lith. *geidžiu* (*geis-ti*) 'to desire, wish for,' so that we might even set up a European *ₔheidhῐa 'to desire.' In his Vergl. Wörterb. (1890), p. 414, he still adheres to his derivation of κισσα from √ₔheidh- (in which he is followed by J. Strachan in Bezz. Beitr. XIV (1889), p. 315), but he no longer makes *χειθ-ῐα the original form, but (*χιθ-σα, i. e.) *χειθ-σα, Idg. ₔheidh-sā.

Brugmann, Gr. II (1888), §110, p. 339 (Eng. ed.), gives a different explanation of κισσα, deriving it from *κικ-ῐα beside Skr. *kiki-s*; Schrader, Prehist. Antiq. of the Aryan Peoples, Part II, Ch. IV ad fin., p. 137 (Eng. ed.), and Part IV, Ch. II, p. 251, and Per Persson, Zur Lehre v. d. Wurzelerweiterung und Wurzelvariation, in Upsala Universitets Årsskrift (1891), p. 194, 2, agree with Brugmann.

So far as κισσα alone is concerned, it might originally contain the same root as κισσός (viz. √ₔhedh-), both containing the same meaning 'to take hold of, cling, grasp after'; but the Laconian form κεῖσσα is against this; moreover, the ι in κισσα would be very difficult, as it could only be explained as having arisen on analogy of κισσός; but I do not know that there is any close connexion, either in literature or in nature, between the 'jay' and 'ivy' to warrant such an explanation.

[1] Cf. κορύσσω from *κορυθ-ῐω beside κόρυς -υθ-ος (Brugm. Gr. II, §768), βυσσός 'the depth of the sea, the bottom' beside βυθός 'the depth, esp. of the sea,' βάσσων Dor. Compar. of βαθύς; etc.; v. G. Meyer, Gr. Gr.², §282, p. 272.

[2] Walter (l. c.) compares also Κιθαιρών, which he translates 'ivy-hill.' But the ι in Κιθαιρών, if indeed this word is also to be derived from √ₔhedh-, is very much more difficult to explain than the ι in κισσός. It seems to me that, if the meaning of Κιθαιρών were 'ivy-hill,' we should expect *Κισσαιρων rather than Κιθαιρών (cf. κισσαρος), for the mere √ₔhedh- by itself means simply 'to cling,' and it is only in conjunction with the suffix -ₒo- (*ₔhedh-ῐo-, whence *κεσσο-, whence κισσο-) that it has acquired in Greek the meaning 'ivy.' Hence κισσο-, not κιθ- (or rather κεθ-), would have to form the basis of the mountain's name. I would therefore entirely separate κισσός and Κιθαιρών, and rather connect the latter with κίθαρις, κιθάρα. The word *κιθαρα, which the derivation of Κιθαιρών from *Κιθαριων presupposes, cannot be identified with Latin *hedera*. The difficulty of the ι : e is too great; nor will Mr. J. H. Moulton's excellent explanation of the ι : e in σκίδνημι : σκεδάω—namely, that they are to be traced to different roots, the first to √sqhait(d)-, the second to √sqhed- (v. Mr. J. H. Moulton in A. J. P., X, p. 285)—help us much here:

Sounds and Inflexions in Greek and Latin (1888), p. 194; Paul Kretschmer in Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXXI (1892), p. 376; and Whitley Stokes in Idg. Forsch., vol. II (1893), p. 170.

hedera I prefer to regard as from Idg. *$_3$hedh-erā*; and we thus have the word for 'ivy' in Greek and Latin formed from one and the same root, but with different formative suffixes.

We may now pass on to discuss the ι : ε of κισσός and *hedera*; all writers seem to agree in assigning these two words to the above-mentioned √$_3$hedh-[1] 'to cling, take hold of'[2]; but the only explanation that has yet been offered for the very difficult ι of κισσός is the proportion κισσός : *hedera* = ἵππος[3] : *equos* (Windisch in Curtius Stud., l. c.), which seems like explaining *ignotum per ignotius*, or, at any rate, *per ignotum*.[4]

Another explanation must, I think, be sought for the ι of κισσός, and it is to be taken from mythology.

Otto Gruppe, Die griechischen Culte und Mythen (1887), a work designed, according to Schrader (Prehist. Antiq., p. 410,

---

there is no evidence, in so far as I am aware, for a √$_3$ha^ĭdh- beside √$_3$hedh-, nor do I think that we can explain the ι of Κιθαιρών as due to the analogy of σκίδνημι : σκεδάω.

[1] *χεθ-ιο-ς must have become *κεθ-ιο-ς (cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §496) before the θ$_ι$ became σσ, as we should otherwise have had *χεσσος and not *κεσσος (whence κισσός).

[2] We may possibly derive χέδροψ or χέδρωψ (which is generally found in the plural χεδροπά 'leguminous fruits,' v. Liddell and Scott, 7th edition), as χέδ-ροψ χέδ-ρωψ, from the √$_3$hed-, which, as we mentioned above, was a prim. Idg. doublet of √$_3$hedh- from which comes *κεσσος (from *κεθ-ιο-ς from *χεθ-ιο-ς from Idg. *$_3$hedh-ιo-). From this √$_3$hed- we have Gk. χανδάνω χείσομαι (v. supra). χέδ-ροψ χέδ-ρωψ has not been subjected to the same influences as κισσός (v. infra), and hence has kept its original ε. If χέδ-ροψ χέδ-ρωψ be rightly thus analysed, -ροψ may bear the same relation to ῥέπω that καλα-ῦροψ 'a shepherd's staff, crook' (cf. Ϝρόπαλον 'club,' G. Meyer, Gr. Gr.², §239) bears to the same ῥέπω (cf. Brugm., Gr. I, §168), -ρωψ may be to ῥέπ-ω as κλώψ to κλέπ-τω (cf. Brugm., Gr. II, §161; Eng. ed., p. 488). The analysis χέδ-ρ-οψ χέδ-ρ-ωψ is of course possible, but does not seem to me so probable, even though at first sight χεδ-ρ- would seem to remind us of Latin *hed-era* from *$_3$hedh-erā (or, of course, equally well *$_3$hed-erā).

[3] For this ι compare Bechtel, Die Hauptprobl. der Idg. Lautlehre (1892), pp. 112 f.

[4] The Pamphylian coin-legend Εστϝέ(ν)διυς (= 'Ασπένδιος) is very interesting as still preserving to us the original ε (Pr. Idg. *ek̂-ιo- : Skr. áçva-, Avest. and Old Pers. aspa-, Lat. *equo-*, Gall. *epo-*); -στ- is an attempt to represent ç (: Skr. áçva); the form 'Ασπενδος is due to Iranianising ('Ασπ- : Avestic and Old Pers. asp-); v. G. Meyer in Idg. Forsch. I 329.

Eng. ed.), 'to deal the death-blow to the notion that the primeval
period had any belief of any sort or description in the gods, and
to demonstrate that the Indo-Europeans were totally without
religion,' says that everything belonging to Idg. religion was
borrowed; and in many cases he is certainly right—the Greek
deity names, for instance, are very largely borrowed from the
Semites and from Egypt.[1] 'The key to the Greek mythology,'
writes Isaac Taylor (The Origin of the Aryans, 1892, pp. 300
sqq.), 'has indeed been found, but it has been discovered, not, as
was anticipated, on the banks of the Ganges, but on those of the
Tigris. Much of the mythology of ancient Greece, instead of
having a common origin with that of India, proves to be essen-
tially non-Aryan, and must have been obtained from Babylonia
through Phoenician channels.' This we might have expected,
inasmuch as the first elements of Greek culture were derived
from the Phoenicians. *Kadmos* was held by the Greeks to have
been a Phoenician who settled in Boeotia, and the Greeks them-
selves agreed with Herodotus (V 58, 59) that most of their letters
(not less than 16) were introduced by him. It has been conjec-
tured that the name of Kadmos himself is simply the Hebrew
Qadmi or *Qadmon* 'an Eastern man,' although, as Otto Gruppe
(Die griech. Culte und Mythen, p. 162) remarks, "Wenigstens
pflegt, wo ein wanderndes Volk nach der Himmelsrichtung be-
nannt wird, die Bezeichnung nicht von ihm selbst, sondern von
einem der Völker auszugehen, zu denen es gelangt; man würde
demnach das griechische nicht das phoinikische Wort erwarten,
wenn Kadmos wirklich die Herkunft bezeichnen sollte." How-
ever, on p. 169 Gruppe includes Kadmos in a list of names which
he agrees that we may recognise as undoubtedly Phoenician, e. g.
Iapetos, Kabeiros, Adonis,[2] *Typhon,*[3] *Acheron,* and others.

Again, it is well known that from Phoenician merchants the
Greeks obtained their knowledge and names of some of the
metals, e. g. χρῡσός[4] 'gold,' κασσίτερος[5] 'tin'; μέταλλον[6] 'mine' is

---

[1] But he can hardly say the same for other Idg. peoples; and indeed there
are one or two prim. Greek cults which cannot be disproved as Indogermanic.

[2] *Adonis* is merely the Semitic *Adonai,* the 'lord' of heaven; v. Isaac Taylor,
The Origin of the Aryans, ch. VI, p. 302.

[3] *Typhon* in Egyptian mythology was one of the children of *Seb* (whom the
Greeks identified with *Kronos*).

[4] Hebr. *chârûz,* Assyr. *ḥurâṣu.*   Schrader, ib., part III, ch. IV, p. 174.

[5] Assyr. *kāsazatirra,* Accad. *id-kasduru.*   Schrader, ib., part III, ch. IX, p. 215 f.

[6] Hebr. *mâtal* 'to smithy,' *m(ĕ)til.*   Schrader, ib., part III, ch. II, p. 155 f.

itself a Semitic word (introduced through the Phoenicians). The name of the coin μνᾶ,[1] again, comes through Hebraic-Assyrian *maneh, mana*, from the *mana* of the Sumerian or pre-Semitic language of the district round Babylon.[2]

Thus, then, we are not surprised to find that the Greeks obtained a considerable portion of their mythologic tales, and many of their deities, from the more cultured Semites; e. g.

Apollo.—The oldest epigraphic form of the Greek name Apollo[3] is *Aplu*,[4] which corresponds to the Semitic *Ablu*, the 'son' of heaven, which was one of the titles of Tammuz, the Syrian sun-god. Compare the form on Thessalian inscriptions; e. g. ἐν τὸ ἱερὸν τοῖ Ἄπλουνος[5] τοῖ Κερδοίοι 'into the temple of Apollo

---

[1] v. Schrader, ib., part II, ch. VI, p. 145.

[2] That Troy itself was in connexion with Babylon, by the time of the third city, is held to have been proved by the finding of a Babylonian silver mina there.

[3] Some scholars have endeavoured to find an Indogermanic origin of the name. Max Müller equated Ἀπέλλων and Skr. *apŏrṇuván* 'removing, opening.' L. v. Schroeder in Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIX (1888) 193 ff. identified Gk. Ἀπόλλων, Cypr. Ἀπείλων with Skr. *saparyéṇya* 'he who should be revered,' which occurs once in the RV. (442, 6) as an epithet of Agni. Schrader, Prehist. Antiq. of the Aryan Peoples (2d edition, 1890), part II, ch. III (Eng. ed., p. 130), holds the same view, but doubtfully, and later on in the same book, part IV, ch. XIII, II (p. 412), he admits that the identity is questionable because of the *e* of Latin *sepelio* (= *sapary*); cf. also Froehde on Ἀπόλλων, in Bezz. Beitr. XIX (1893), pp. 230 ff., who rejects Schroeder's identification not only on phonetic grounds, but also because the designation of a god as 'the one who should be revered' is not sufficiently descriptive, and does not bring out any characteristic excellence of the god in question. Contrast Ἠριγένεια, Ἑκάεργος, Ἐννοσίγαιος; Froehde (ib., p. 240) holds that Ἀπέλλων was the earliest form of the god's name, and gives three possible analyses of the word: (1) Ἀπ- is the root and ελλων a 'suffixverbindung,' comparable to that in ἀελλα Ἀελλώ κύπελλον. (2) Ἀπ- is preposition and ἑλλων the word. This is the view of Welcker and others, who derive the name from ἀπείλω, Aeol. ἀπέλλω (cf. Hesych. ἀπέλλειν · ἀπείργειν), explaining it as the averter of evil and adversity (ἀλεξίκακος). (3) Ἀ- is 'prothetic' and πέλλων the word. This Froehde considers to be the correct analysis. He finds in the 'prothetic' *a* the Latin *ad* = Goth. *at*, Phryg. *αδ* in αδδακετ (= ἀνέθηκε). -πέλλων he compares to Germ. *spellan* : Goth. *spilla* 'announcer, proclaimer' (aivaggeljons), OHG. *wār-spello* 'prophet,' etc. In the pre-Germanic time the Germanic root *spel-* had beside it a form *pel-*; cf. Latin **pellāre* in compounds, e. g. *appellāre, compellāre*, etc.

[4] Isaac Taylor, ib., p. 304.

[5] Thessalian *ου* corresponds to ordinary Greek *ω*; in other words, while the rest of Greece pronounced the original long sound (as in ἔδω-κε) open, the Thessalians pronounced it close (ἔδουκε); v. Blass, Ausspr. des Griech.[3], §§9, 12, and Brugmann, Grundr. I, §88.

Kerdoios' (Cauer, Delect. Inscrr. Graec., No. 409, ll. 22 and 44), date 214 B. C.; Ἀπλουνι Κερδ[ο]ίου Σουσίπατρος . . . ὀνέθεικε 'To Apollo Kerdoios Sosipater . . . dedicated' (Cauer, ib., No. 417; C. I. G. 1766); Ἀπλουνι Τεμπείτα Αἰσχυλὶς Σατύροι ἐλευθέρια 'To (i. e. in honour of) Apollo of Tempe Aischulis daughter of Saturos celebrates the feast of Liberty' (Cauer, ib., No. 420).

Again, in Homer we find, it is true, the cults of Dionysos and Aphrodite, but their position in Homer is such as to make us *suspect* that they are rather a late importation, and hence we are not surprised when we find that they are certainly borrowed.

Aphrodite.—Aphrodite is really the great Semitic goddess *Istar*, brought by the Phoenicians under the name *Astarte* or *Ashteroth* to Cyprus, whence, with her name changed by popular etymology to Ἀφροδίτη 'the foam-born,' her worship spread among the Greeks.

Dionysos.—The theory of the Indian origin of the great Dionysiac myth was shaken by Lenormant's comparison of Dionysos with *Dianisu*, the Assyrian sun-god (found, e. g., at Babylon); and this was confirmed by Dr. Neubauer's identification of his mother *Semele*, daughter of the Phoenician Kadmos, with the Phoenician goddess *Semlath*, and with the Edomite '*Semlah of the vine-land*' (v. Isaac Taylor, ib., p. 304);—we should remember that Dionysos or Bacchos was the special god of Thebes (cf. Soph. Ant. 1109 or 1121 Βακχεῦ, Βακχᾶν μητρόπολιν Θήβαν ἐνναίων), and that Kadmos the Phoenician, 'the Eastern man,' is said to have built Thebes, with its acropolis, the Kadmeia—and in connexion with this close intimacy between Thebes and the Phoenicians, we may mention that Dionysos is represented in the legend as having, on his way to India, travelled through *Egypt*, *Syria*, and thence through all *Asia* (cf. Strab. XV, p. 687; Eurip. Bacch. 13), as having crossed the *Euphrates*, on which stood *Babylon*, and then the *Tigris*, on the left bank of which was the district called *Kissia*.

We have just seen that Dianisu was the sun-god of the Assyrians. Now, the Assyrian Empire, the earliest and most extensive of the empires of the East, extended, at the time of its greatest prosperity, over the south of Asia from the Indus on the east to the Mediterranean Sea on the west, including among its subjects the Babylonians. Such being the extent of their empire, it is not unnatural to suppose that the Assyrians enforced their religion in great measure on their subjects, and to suppose further that many

local cults may have arisen in connexion with the great Assyrian
gods. One such cult may have arisen in *Kissia*, a district of
Susiana, in honour of Dianisu, so that there was a '*Kissian
Dianisu*' just as there was a Νυσήιος Διώνυσος (Aristoph., Frogs
215; cf. Hom. Il. VI 132, 133), and again a Δάλιος 'Απόλλων (Soph.,
Ai. 689 or 704), etc.

Kissia is not without mention in Greek literature :—

Hdt. III 91, 6 says that 300 talents was the tribute ἀπὸ Σούσων,
καὶ τῆς ἄλλης Κισσίων χώρης, which together constituted the νομὸς
ὄγδοος, or 'eighth satrapy.'

Hdt. V 49. Aristagoras, the tyrant of Miletos, went to Kleo-
menes, King of Sparta, to invoke his aid on behalf of the Ionians
against Darius, King of Persia. He brought with him a bronze
map, in which had been cut γῆς ἁπάσης περίοδος, καὶ θάλασσά τε πᾶσα,
καὶ ποταμοὶ πάντες ;—Λυδοί, Φρύγες, Καππαδόκαι (τοὺς ἡμεῖς Συρίους καλέ-
ομεν), Κίλικες, 'Αρμένιοι, Ματιηνοί are mentioned one after another in
this order, ἔχεται δὲ τούτων (SC. τῶν Ματιηνῶν) γῆ ἥδε Κισσίη · ἐν τῇ δὴ
παρὰ ποταμὸν τόνδε Χοάσπην κείμενά ἐστι τὰ Σοῦσα ταῦτα, ἔνθα βασιλεύς τε
μέγας δίαιταν ποιέεται, καὶ τῶν χρημάτων οἱ θησαυροὶ ἐνθαῦτά εἰσι · ἑλόντες
δὲ ταύτην τὴν πόλιν, θαρσέοντες ἤδη τῷ Διὶ πλούτου πέρι ἐρίζετε.

Hdt. V 52, 9 ἡ Κισσίη χώρη is again mentioned.

Hdt. VI 119, 2. Datis and Artaphernes brought the conquered
Eretrians to Darius at Susa, and he settled them at one of his
own stations in *Kissia*.

Aesch. Cho. 423 ἔκοψα κομμὸν *"Αριον ἔν τε Κισσίας *νόμοις ἰηλεμι-
στρίας ' I strike a Persian blow (upon my breast) and like a Kissian
mourner,' meaning generally 'I wail in Eastern fashion' (A.
Sidgwick).

Aeschylus in Strabo, XV, p. 728 : Λέγονται δὲ καὶ Κίσσιοι οἱ Σούσιοι.
φησὶ δὲ καὶ Αἰσχύλος τὴν μητέρα Μέμνονος Κισσίαν [Aesch. Fr. 264, in
Dindorf, Poet. Scen. Graec.⁷, p. 609; Butler thinks the reference
is to Aeschylus' Ψυχοστασία].

We have seen above that Διόνυσος is borrowed from the Assyrian
Dianisu, and that there very probably may have been a special
'*Kissian Dianisu*,' which may have been likewise borrowed and
incorporated into Greek mythology ; and indeed this theory
receives considerable support from the fact that Κισσός was
actually one of the two names under which Dionysos was wor-
shipped in the Attic deme Acharnae, according to Pausanias, I
31, 6 "Εστι δὲ 'Αχαρναὶ δῆμος · οὗτοι . . . τὴν 'Ιππίαν 'Αθηνᾶν ὀνομάζουσι καὶ

Διόνυσον Μελπόμενον καὶ Κισσὸν[1] τὸν αὐτὸν θεόν, τὸν κισσὸν τὸ φυτὸν ἐνταῦθα πρῶτον φανῆναι λέγοντες.   (The last eight words are in all probability merely an 'aetiological myth' to account for the name Κισσός as applied to the god Dionysos.)[2]

Then at a later date the ivy *κεσσος (Lat. *hedera*) came to be a favourite symbol in the religious rites of Dionysos (cf. Soph. Ant. 1130; Eur. Phoen. 651; Bacch. 25, 81, 105 and passim; Aristoph. Thesm. 999; Homeric Hymns, XXVI 9; etc., etc.).   Thus when *κεσσος 'ivy' became associated with the worship of Κίσσιος Διόνυσος, or Κισσὸς Διόνυσος as at Acharnae (v. supra), *κεσσος became κισσός on analogy of the epithet κίσσιος or Κισσός of the god, with whose worship it was so intimately bound up; whence also the name Κισσεύς,[3] etc.; and then, in the popular consciousness, any epithet of the god such as Κίσσιος and κισσός, its oriental origin having been completely forgotten, would be connected no longer with anything save κισσός 'ivy.'

St. John's College, Cambridge, Eng.   LIONEL HORTON-SMITH.
December, 1894.

[1] Liddell and Scott (7th edition) read, I suppose, Κισσέα, as they quote this passage under Κισσεύς; but Dindorf reads Κισσόν, and he is herein followed by Dr. Sandys on Eurip. Bacch. 81, and by Preller-Robert, Gr. Mythologie, vol. I, part II, pp. 661 and 676.

[2] We also find Κισσός used as the name of a satyr in C. I. G. 7461. Perhaps this was merely due to a desire to hand on one of the names of the god of revelry to one of his satyr-attendants.

[3] It should be mentioned that Κισσεύς, a surname of Dionysos in Paus. 1, 31, 6, Suid. [according to the reading of Liddell and Scott (v. supra)], is used also of Apollo in Aeschylus, Fr. 394 or 383: " Ὁ κισσεὺς Ἀπόλλων, ὁ Καβαῖος, ὁ μάντις." Σαβαῖος Barnesius ad Eurip. Bacchar., v. 408 (Dindorf, Poet. Scen. Graec.[7], p. 613). Preller-Roberts, Gr. Mythol., vol. I, part II, p. 713, read ὁ Βακχεύς for ὁ Καβαῖος. Compare also Macrobius, Saturnal. I 18, 6: " Euripides in Licymnio Apollinem Liberumque unum eundemque deum esse significans scribit Δέσποτα φιλόδαφνε Βάκχε, Παιὰν Ἀπολλον εὔλυρε." For the close association of Dionysos and Apollo at Delphi, see Dr. Sandys, Eurip. Bacch., p. xiv, and be it remembered that both these gods were borrowed from the East (see above).

IV.—KRATINOS AND ARISTOPHANES ON THE CRY OF THE SHEEP.

It is universally held that Kratinos and Aristophanes, each separately and independently, represent the sound of the sheep-cry (*baa*) by βῆ βῆ or simple βῆ, in the following two fragments:

Ὁ δ' ἠλίθιος ὥσπερ πρόβατον βῆ βῆ λέγων βαδίζει.—Krat. Frg. 43, ed. Kock.
Θύειν με μέλλει καὶ κελεύει βῆ λέγειν.—Arist. Frg. 642, ibid.
Compare Suidas βηβῆν· πρόβατον.

The object of this paper is an attempt to show that the original form of this famous βῆ βῆ was, as written by Kratinos, not BH BH but BEBE (if not BEBEE); that this BEBE does not represent the sheep-cry, but means the *sheep* itself; and that the words ὥσπερ πρόβατον are an interpolation originally intended as an explanation of the mistaken βῆ βῆ. My reasons for this contention are founded on historical, grammatical and rational grounds.

And first of all let it be noted that both the above fragments have come down to us through Byzantine commentators (Suidas, Zonaras, Eustathios) of the 10th–13th century, and that the MSS of these authorities are of a still later date (13th–15th century).[1] It will be further remembered that both Kratinos and Aristophanes were Athenians, and that they wrote before the introduction

---

[1] The sources referred to are the following:

I. **Eustathios** 1721, 27 (μ 265): ὅτι κυριολεκτῶν λέγει μυκηθμὸν ἀκοῦσαι βοῶν αὐλιζομενάων οἰῶν τε βληχήν. μυκῶνται γὰρ αἱ βόες, βληχᾶται δέ ὀῖς. εἰ δέ που ἐν Ἰλιάδι ἐπὶ προβάτου (-των?) καὶ αἰγῶν κεῖται κοινῶς ὁμοῦ τὸ μηκᾶσθαι, συλληπτικὸς ὁ τρόπος ἐκεῖ. αἶγες γὰρ κυρίως μηκῶνται, προβάτων δὲ οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ἡ βληχή. ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι μάλιστα τὸ βῆ φωνῆς προβάτων ἐστὶ σημαντικόν. καὶ φέρεται καὶ παρὰ Αἰλίῳ Διονυσίῳ καὶ χρῆσις Κρατίνου τοιαύτη· ὁ δ' ἠλίθιος ὥσπερ πρόβατον βῆ βῆ λέγων βαδίζει.—Then again 768, 14 οἱ δ' αὐτοί φασιν ὁμοίως μιμητικῶς καὶ βῆ, οὐ μὴν βαί, μίμησιν προβάτων φωνῆς. Κρατῖνος· ὁ δ' ἠλίθιος κτλ.

II. **Et. M.** 196, 7 βῆ τὸ μιμητικὸν τῆς τῶν προβάτων φωνῆς οὐχὶ βαὶ λέγεται Ἀττικῶς. Κρατῖνος Διονυσαλεξάνδρῳ· ὁ δ' ἠλίθιος κτλ. ῥητορικὴ δέ ἐστιν ἡ λέξις.

III. **Suid.** βῆ· τὸ μιμητικὸν τῆς τῶν προβάτων φωνῆς, οὐχὶ βαὶ λέγουσιν Ἀττικοί. Κρατῖνος Διονυσαλεξάνδρῳ· ὁ δ' ἠλίθιος κτλ.

That all these references point to a common source (apparently to Aelios Dionysios) need not be emphasized here.

of the vowel H into the alphabet of their country, since this took place not earlier than the latter part or rather the close of the fifth century B. C.[1] We also know that by that time Kratinos was already dead and Aristophanes an elderly man, conservative by nature and hardly capable of overcoming the force of his early orthographic habits. In these circumstances, even if we admit that the above two verses, such as they have come down to us, go back to Kratinos and Aristophanes, there remains the incontrovertible fact that the vowel H cannot, in any circumstance, belong to Kratinos and hardly to Aristophanes. In its place there must have originally stood a long E, if not a double EE, for this phonetic representation of the sheep-cry is not only rational and natural, but is also supported by ancient authorities. Varro, R. R. 2, 1 non enim mee sed *bee* sonare videntur oves vocem efferentes. But whether we assume a long E or a double EE, at any rate we have the clue to the present spelling βῆ βῆ: the transcribers knowing as they did that in Attic Greek the old (pre-Eukleidian) long E was at their time represented generally by H, and that in case of an original EE the new Attic orthography admitted of no double vowels (as *aa*, εε, ηη, οο, etc.), but substituted generally η for εε, changed BE (or BEE) to BH. That this is a fact which led to many other misrepresentations need not be dwelt upon here, since it is a common experience not only with modern but also with ancient critics.[2] For the confusion of ο and ω in

---

[1] A few sporadic instances of H between 445 and 430 B. C. are cited by K. Meisterhans in his Gram.[3], p. 3.

[2] Gal. t. 17, II, p. 111: Γραψάντων γὰρ τῶν παλαιῶν τόν τε τοῦ η̄ δὴ φθόγγον (ubi male δίφθογγον) καὶ τὸν τοῦ ε̄ δι' ἑνὸς χαρακτῆρος ὃς νῦν μόνον (ubi male μόνος) σημαίνει τὸν ἕτερον φθόγγον, τὸν ε̄ (ubi male η), πολλὰ γέγονεν ἁμαρτήματα τῶν ἐγγραφομένων, οὐ κατὰ τὴν γνώμην τῶν γραψάντων τὴν μετάθεσιν τῶν γραμμάτων ποιησαμένων. διὸ καὶ προσέχειν ἀκριβῶς χρὴ ταῖς τοιαύταις γραφαῖς ἐν αἷς δυνατόν ἐστι τὸν τοῦ η̄ φθόγγον εἰς τὸν τοῦ ε̄ μεταθέντας ἢ τοὐπαλιν γράψαντας ἐπανορθώσασθαι τὴν γραφήν. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ο̄ καὶ ω̄ ποιητέον, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τούτων ἀμφοτέρων οἱ φθόγγοι δι' ἑνὸς χαρακτῆρος ἐγράφοντο. This comment refers on the σκῆψις or σκέψις of Hippocrates.

Schol. Eur. (ed. E. Schwartz) Phoen. 682 σοί νιν ἔγγονοι: γράφεται καὶ: σῷ νιν ἐκγόνῳ κτίσαν, ἵν' ᾖ· τῷ ἐκγόνῳ σου, Ἔπαφε, τῷ Κάδμῳ αἱ θεαὶ κατέκτισαν τὰς Θήβας. γέγονε δὲ περὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἁμάρτημα. ἄρχοντος γὰρ Ἀθήνησιν Εὐκλείδου μήπω τῶν μακρῶν εὑρημένων τοῖς βραχέσιν ἀντὶ τῶν μακρῶν ἐχρῶντο, τῷ ε̄ ἀντὶ τοῦ η̄ καὶ τῷ ο̄ ἀντὶ τοῦ ω̄. ἔγραφον οὖν τὸ δήμῳ μετὰ τοῦ ι· δήμοι. μὴ νοήσαντες δὲ ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν γραφήν ἐστι καὶ <ὅτι> δεῖ μεταθεῖναι τὸ ο̄ εἰς τὸ ω̄ ἐτάραξαν τὸ νοητόν.

The veracity of these testimonies is disputed by Prof. F. Blass in his Gr. Palaeogr.[2] (I. Müller's Handbuch, vol. I[2]), §3, who argues that the Ionic

Homer compare Aristonikos, Λ 104; Schol. Townl. H 238; Por-
phyr. quaest. 8 (p. 287, Schrader on Φ 127); α 52.   For ε and η,
Schol. Ξ 241; α 275.   For ει and ηι, α 252.

Thus far, then, we see that Kratinos must have written, not
BHBH, but BEBE(E).   Now the next question naturally suggesting
itself is, What does this BEBE(E) mean?   The assumption univer-
sally held is that it represents the *sound* of the sheep-cry; this
interpretation is also very natural after the parenthetical explan-
ation ὥσπερ πρόβατον.   But when we come to a closer examination
of the line, we are confronted with many difficulties.   In the
first place, it is hardly conceivable that a person, however stupid
or silly (ἠλίθιος), could walk about and say (λέγειν) *baa baa*.   Then
we cannot admit that sheep bleat in the double cry *baa baa*.   The
dog barks, it is true, *bow wow* (and so it is rendered in ancient as
well as modern Greek, viz. αὖ αὖ, and γαῦ γαῦ or γάου γάου respec-
tively), but in the case of sheep, a repeated BE BE is too unnatural

---

alphabet must have been in both private and literary use long before it made
its appearance in the inscriptions, and that consequently the Attic tragedians
must have written their plays in that alphabet.   But neither he nor his
authority (U. Köhler in Mitth. d. arch. Inst. Athen. 10 (1885), pp. 359–79)
adduces any dated voucher.   The latter archaeologist rests his hypothesis
merely on the 'external form of the letters,' particularly on the 'triangular
shape of sigma,' a certainly not safe criterion when the issue turns on the
narrow period of a couple of decades (cp. W. Larfeld, Gr. Epigr., in I. Müller's
Handbuch, vol. I², p. 527 sq.).   If writers and private scribes had been leading
the way towards the spelling reform, how is it that a whole century later Plato
and his contemporaries still clung to the old Attic fashion of writing O for
both ο and ου, and E for both ε and ει?   This is also expressly admitted by
Prof. Blass himself in more than one place, and is inserted by him in his
recent revision of Kühner's Ausf. Gram. (vol. I³, 318 A. 4), where he says:
"Plato (Crat. 416 B) setzt den Unterschied zwischen καλὸν und καλοῦν, beides
damals ΚΑΛΟΝ geschrieben, ausser in die Quantität, auch in die ἁρμονία, d. i.
den Accent."

Another argument of Prof. Blass is that Kallias, as reported by Klearchos
the peripatetic (cited by Athen. 7, 276 a. 10, 453 sq.), had composed his
reputed γραμματικὴ τραγῳδία, a sort of ABC play, in the Ionic alphabet, and
that Euripides had used the vowel H in his Θησεύς.   This statement, however,
is of questionable value, seeing that Kallias' personality and time are, as Prof.
Blass himself owns, wrapped in obscurity.   Kallias' γραμματικὴ τραγῳδία, we are
told by Klearchos, was pirated by Sophocles in his Oedipus and wholly copied
by Euripides in his Medea.   The charge against Euripides is particularly
grave, since he is represented to have pirated also the music.   But this is not
all: Euripides, we are further told, copied again in his Θησεύς Kallias' ABC
play, now styled γραμματικὴ θεωρία.   The improbability of such a story is too
glaring and palpable to claim any serious consideration.

to be admitted and unworthy of such a shrewd observer as Kratinos. The difficulty is further increased by the circumstance that both BE BE's—two certainly very long syllables—coincide in *one* foot, and that without caesura, whereas the nature of the case would require a long interval between the two BE's (*baa! baa!*). Add to these inconveniences the equally strong objection that the preceding parenthetic explanation ὥσπερ πρόβατον militates against the metre, since it forms an anapest unwonted in the fourth foot.[1] Finally, it militates also against grammar, considering that the term πρόβατον meant at Kratinos' time simply *cattle*, *herd*, and stood mostly in the plural.

In face of so many anomalies, let us see whether we may find elsewhere some analogous instances tending to throw light on the subject. We find that Aristophanes himself, in another well-known place (Nub. 1380 sq.), puts in the mouth of Strepsiades the following coarse reproach :

καὶ πῶς δικαίως; ὅστις, ὦ 'ναίσχυντε, σ' ἐξέθρεψα
αἰσθανόμενός σου πάντα τραυλίζοντος ὅ, τι νοοίης.
εἰ μὲν γε βρῦν (?) εἴποις, ἐγὼ γνοὺς ἂν πιεῖν ἐπέσχον ·
μαμμᾶν δ' ἂν αἰτήσαντος ἡκόν σοι φέρων ἂν ἄρτον,
κακκᾶν δ' ἂν οὐκ ἔφθης φράσας κἀγὼ λαβὼν θύραζε
ἐξέφερον ἂν καὶ προυσχόμην σε. σὺ δέ με νῦν ἀπάγχων
  βοῶντα καὶ κεκραγόθ' ὅτι
  χεζητιῴην, οὐκ ἔτλης
  ἔξω 'ξενεγκὼν, ὦ μιαρέ,
  θύραζέ μ', ἀλλὰ πνιγόμενος
  αὐτοῦ 'ποίησα κακκᾶν.

It is unnecessary to remind here that the above scene alludes to the childhood of Pheidippides and that the words βρῦν (?),[2] μαμμᾶν and κακκᾶν are taken from the language of little children. This is also corroborated by the fact that these words are still surviving unchanged in the vocabulary of little children in the Greece of to-day.

Another parallel instance is found in the Anth. Pal. 11, 67, 4 :

βάπτε δὲ τὰς λευκὰς καὶ λέγε πᾶσι ταττᾶ.

---

[1] "Propter anapaestum in quarto pede inusitatum Porson. Hec. praef. XLV ὡς πρόβατον; Reisig. Coniect. 99 [?] ὥσπερ πρόβατα; Elmslei. Cens. Hec. Pors. ed. Lips. 268 ὁ δ' ἠλίθιος βῆ βῆ λέγων ὥσπερ πρόβατον βαδίζει."—Kock.

[2] See following footnote.

This satire of Myrinos is directed against a prudish κορωνεκάβη who, wishing to appear youthful, dyes her hair and calls ταττᾶ (cf. τέττα), a term for πατήρ still very common among infants in Greece.

The above striking coincidence between ancient and modern Greek terms in the language of little children is certainly very suggestive, and the parallel is worth following a step further.   In addition to μαμμᾶ for *bread*, ταττᾶ for *dada, papa*, and κακκᾶ for *stool,* modern Greek infants say μπεμπέ, i. e. *bebé,* for *ba-lamb, sheep,*[1] a word manifestly identical with the βηβῆν of Suidas and the βῆ βῆ

[1] It may be in place here to add some more specimens out of the vocabulary used at present by little children in Greece.   It generally consists of dissyllables formed by repetition of the characteristic syllable.   Thus, besides *bebé,* μαμμᾶ, ταττᾶ, κακκᾶ, quoted above, Cretan infants say νινί for *baby, doll,* λιλί for *toy,* νανᾶ for *sleep (byby),* μιμί for *a sore place, pain,* πωπῶ (or ποπό) for *lap,* βουβοῦ for *beating* (punishment), ντεντέ or *dedé* for *horse (jeejee),* πιπί for *garment,* (τὰ) νιανιά (disyllabic) for *dress,* (τὰ) μναμνά or, as it is generally pronounced by infants, μιαμιά (disyllabic) for *food, dish,* μπουμποῦ or *boubou* for *water, drink.* In the earlier stage of infancy children make themselves, or are taught to make themselves, understood by uttering only one syllable.   Thus they say μᾶ for *μαμμᾶ bread, dé* for *dedé horse,* and μποῦ or *boû* for *boubou water.*   This *boû,* pronounced by the parents *boûn,* points to a connection with the above-mentioned βρῦν of Aristophanes.   That such a keen observer as the great comedian could not put a ρ into the mouth of babies is in itself sufficiently clear, and has already been duly discussed by eminent critics.

"Anecd. Bekk. 31, 9 βρῦ· τὸ ὑποκόρισμα, ὃ ἐστι λεγόμενον τοῖς παιδίοις σύμβολον τοῦ πιεῖν· ὅπερ ἔνιοι σὺν τῷ ō γράφουσι: βροῦ.   Et Antiatticista ibidem p. 85, 28 βρῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ πιεῖν. Ἀριστοφάνης Νεφέλαις δευτέραις.   Eustathius, p. 1106, 12 (1142, 18) βρῦν ex Aristophane affert.   H. Stephanus in Thes. T. III, p. 33, 34 [s. v. βρύλλω] litteram ρ in ore balbutientium puerorum miratus, βῦν legendum censebat, Varronis *buas* apud Nonium comparans.   Eadem etiam Scaligeri sententia fuit qui in ed. Aristophanis a. 1624 adnotavit: βῦν vel etiam πῖν· non autem βρῦν."—G. Hermann in Ar. Nub. 1340.

The conjecture proposed by H. Stephanus and Scaliger is certainly based on rational grounds, but the presence of *boûn* (μποῦν) in modern Greek points more probably to a palaeographic mistake: BPΥΝ for BOΥΝ.   That the copiers may have taken exception to βοῦν, because of its coincidence with the accusative of βοῦς, is also highly probable.   At all events, the sound of ρ is unutterable to infants, and very often difficult even for youngsters.   Thus the latter now in Greece frequently say μικός (also μικιός disyllabic) for μικρός, a form current also among grown-up people in the sense of *tiny.*   That this neo-Hellenic μικός is a direct survival of the ancient μικός (Ar. Ach. 909; Theocr., Call., Choerob.), found also in the Attic inscriptions (I. A. II χρυσία μικά, κανᾶ μικᾶ, οἰνοχόη μικά, τράπεζαι μικαί, K. Meisterhans, Gram.[2], p. 63, 6), is almost certain.

of Kratinos, thus misspelt for the genuine BEBE(E) or βεβί(ε). As to the final ν in the above words μαμμᾶν, κακκᾶν, βηβῆν, βρῦν, it is nothing else than a movable ν added for metric or euphonic considerations. No man certainly will maintain that little children are wont or even able to close their vocables with a final consonant (cf. pussy, dolly, doggy, birdy, etc.).

And now the explanation of the difficulty about Kratinos' βῆ βῆ suggests itself: The great satirist, like Aristophanes and Myrinos, lashes some silly man or lad who, like the old woman in the Anth. Pal., is craving to pass for a youth, and in his natural exaggeration represents him as toddling (βαδίζει) and saying *ba-lamb.* The spelling, therefore, βῆ βῆ is untenable and should be corrected to BEBE, if not BEBEE, for it is an indeclinable substantive meaning *ba-lamb, sheep.*

It further becomes evident that the remark ὥσπερ πρόβατον, standing as it does as a parenthetic explanation, is an interpolation chargeable to some scribe who, having mistaken the double BEBE for the sheep-cry, remarked on the margin or between the lines the explanation ὥσπερ πρόβατον, a note which soon found its way into the text and led to the present condition of the verse. That this is actually the case appears sufficiently also from the metrical and grammatical inconveniences mentioned above: the words ὥσπερ πρόβατον are inadmissible in themselves, because of the position of πρόβατον as an anapest in the fourth foot; because of its usage in the singular; and because of its different meaning at Kratinos' time.

It is needless to add here that the insertion of ὥσπερ πρόβατον into the tetrameter has naturally led to the sacrifice of the last dipody :

$$\text{ὁ δ' ἠλίθιος BEBE(E) λέγων βαδίζει} — \cup \text{ι} \stackrel{\cdot}{-}.$$

'the silly fellow toddles about, saying *ba-lamb.*'

If the results thus obtained be correct, they acquire additional significance in another sense, inasmuch as they destroy the force of the argument generally based on this *locus classicus* as to the pronunciation of η like Latin or Italian long *ē.*

A. N. JANNARIS.

V.—A CONTRIBUTION TO LATIN LEXICOGRAPHY.[1]

In a paper printed in this Journal (vol. XIV, pp. 216–25) I called attention to the fact that the Lewis and Short Latin Lexicon was, for Gellius at least, an unsatisfactory guide. The present paper, which is concerned chiefly, though not wholly, with Gellius, is a continuation of the work there begun. In its preparation I have had before me constantly four books: the Lewis and Short Latin Lexicon, Nettleship's Contributions to Latin Lexicography, Georges' Ausführliches lateinisches-deut-sches Handwörterbuch (7th edition), and the same author's Lexi-kon der lateinischen Wortformen. Nothing has been included in the present paper which has been adequately treated in any of these works. Several words here treated have never before been recorded. Since, however, the bulk of the notes consists of new references for words already known, I desire to point out that of the whole body of such material gathered in the course of my reading I have here given such references only as seemed to me, after full deliberation, to add materially to our knowledge of the particular word's history.

1. ABORTIO = *miscarriage* occurs Gell. 3. 16. 21 cum abortio quibusdam, non partus, videretur mensis octavi intempestivitas.

ADAGIUM. Add Gell. 1. 8. 4 frequens apud Graecos adagium.

ADMINISTRATOR. Add Tertull. Spect. 22 auctores et admini-stratores spectaculorum.

ADUNCUS. Add Hor. Sat. 1. 6. 5 naso suspendis adunco, with reference to Persius 1. 40 nimis uncis naribus indulges.

ADUSQUE is cited by L. and S. as Horace, Sat. " 1, 5, 96 ; 97." Correct to Sat. 1. 5. 96 and 1. 1. 97, and add Gell. 2. 24. 15 a trecentis sestertiis adusque duo sestertia.

ADVERSITOR. Some reference should be made by L. and S. to the phrases *adversum venire*, or *ire*, cited by them under 2 *adversus* A. To the passages there given add Plaut. Most. 1. 4. 1, and see Lorenz ad loc.

AEQUABILITER. Add Gell. 1. 20. 5 In numeris etiam similiter κύβος dicitur, cum omne latus eiusdem numeri aequabiliter in sese solvitur, sicuti fit cum ter terna ducuntur atque ipse numerus terplicatur.

AERARIUS is cited by L. and S. (s. v. II, 2) from Gell. "4, 12 and 29." Correct to Gell. 4. 12. 1 and 4. 20. 6; Masur. Sab. ap. Gell. 4. 20. 11.

AES. L. and S. (s. v. C) cite a few instances in which the genitive *aeris* depending on *milia* is used in expressions of money as = *assium*. The passages quoted are all, save one, from Livy. Add first of all Livy 1. 43. §§1 and 10; Varro, L. L. IX 83. If we read *octonos . . . aeris* in Horace, Sat. 1. 6. 75 we may say that *aeris* depends on *asses* understood, or better, that the gender of *octonos* is derived by a constructio ad sensum from the thought of *assium* to which *aeris* is equivalent. Palmer, in his note on Horace, l. l., cites three parallels to *octonos aeris*, and in his 'Additional Notes,' p. 383[4], refers to Gell. 2. 24. The following is a complete list of the examples of this use in Gellius: (*a*) with *milia* or *summa*, 6. 13. 1 qui centum et viginti quinque *milia aeris* ampliusve censi erant; 6. 13. 2 qui minore *summa aeris* . . . censebantur; 10. 6. 3 *aeris gravis* viginti quinque *milia*; (*b*) 2. 24. 2 centenos vicenosque aeris; §3 lex Fannia lata est, quae . . . *centenos aeris* insumi concessit decemque aliis diebus . . . *tricenos*, ceteris autem diebus omnibus *denos*; §5 centenos aeris; §6 aeris alias tricenos, alias denos; §7 centenos, ducenos, tricenos with aeris; 11. 1. 2 idcirco postea lege Aternia constituti sunt in oves singulas *aeris deni*, in boves *aeris centeni*. It will be worth while to quote 20. 1. 12 in full (Favorinus is the speaker): Quod vero dixi videri quaedam (sc. in legibus XII Tab.) esse impendio molliora, nonne tibi quoque videtur nimis esse dilutum, quod ita de iniuria poenienda scriptum est: "Si iniuriam alteri faxsit, *viginti quinque aeris* poenae sunto." Quis enim erit tam inops, quem ab iniuriae faciendae libidine *viginti quinque asses* deterreant?

AGON. Add Gell. 10. 18. 5 Artemisia . . . agona, id est, certamen laudibus eius (= Mausoli) dicundis facit.

ALCEDO. The form *alcyon* is written by Gell. 3. 10. 5 dies quibus alcyones . . . nidulantur. The source of this whole chapter is the *Hebdomades* of Varro: see the lemma, also §1.

ALEA. "The tesserae had six sides, which were marked with I. II. III. IV. V. VI." So L. and S., s. v. I, and Prof. Peck on

Suet. Aug. 71. Rich, however, s. v. *tessera*, gives an example
marked with spots precisely as dice are marked to-day. This is
said to be a copy "of an original of ivory found at Herculaneum."
Compare Marquardt, Privatleben², p. 847: "Diese Würfel, bei
den Griechen κύβοι, bei den Römern *tesserae* genannt, sind, wie
die unsrigen, auf jeder der sechs Seiten mit einer Zahlbezeich-
nung, und zwar mit einem, zwei, drei, vier, fünf, und sechs
Punkten versehen." See also Seyffert (as translated by Nettle-
ship and Sandys), s. v. *Dice*. In fact, the whole account of dice-
playing, as given in L. and S., requires revision in the light of
Marquardt's treatment, pp. 847-54. For example, L. and S.
imply that both with the *tesserae* and the *tali* the throws were
valued according to the number of points turned up. Marquardt,
p. 852, says of the *tali*: "Man ersieht hieraus dass nicht die
Summe der geworfenen Einheiten entscheidend war . . ." His
opinion is that the throws of the *tali* were valued according to
the faces *turned down*, i. e. on which the dice rested, a view the
very opposite of that generally given, e. g. by Hallidie on Plaut.
Capt. 73, and Professor Smith on Hor. Odes, ii. 7. 25.

ALTILIS. Add Petron. 65 gallinae altiles, and compare id. 40
qui altilia laceravit.

AMBITIOSE is defined by L. and S. simply as "ambitiously,
ostentatiously," a meaning which will not fit Livy 1. 35. 2 isque
primus . . . petisse ambitiose regnum dicitur. There it signifies
rather *by a regular, personal canvass*, and so = *per ambitum*.
Cf. Weissenborn: "Livius denkt an den *ambitus* der späteren
Zeit." For a good commentary on *ambitiose* in this passage see
Plaut. Amphitr. Prol. 64-74.

AMICULA. Add Tert. De Cor. Mil. 12 Veneris . . . matris
Aeneadarum, etiam amiculae Martis.

APIROCALUS is not registered at all by L. and S. Georges
defines it simply as "im Schönen unerfahren, geschmacklos." It
occurs but once, Gell. 11. 7. 7 Alter quoque a lectionibus id genus
paucis apirocalus . . . Some MSS and the older editions read
ἀπειρόκαλος (see Liddell and Scott, s. v.). Weiss translates by
"Einfaltspinsel." For a commentary on the word compare Gell.
1. 5. 3 tum voce molli atque demissa Hortensius "Dionysia"
inquit "Dionysia malo equidem esse quam quod tu, Torquate,
ἄμουσος, ἀναφρόδιτος, ἀπροσδιόνυσος," a passage, by the way, not cited
by Liddell and Scott on any of the three Greek words contained
therein. Elsewhere Gellius employs several Latin words to

convey the meaning expressed by *apirocalus* in our passage; cf. *nugator* 15. 2. 2; *insubidus* 12. 2. 11, 19. 9. 9; *nebulo* 15. 2. 4, 16. 12. 6. Cf. also *insulse* dicere 16. 12. 6.

APPRIME. Add the following passages from Gellius: 5. 21. 1, 13. 12. 1, 17. 7. 3 a. doctus; 9. 13. 1 a. nobilis; 18. 5. 10 Lucilius, vir a. linguae Latinae sciens. See Neue-Wagener 2, 628.

ARCTOS. Add Sen. Med. 407 dum siccas polus versabit arctos, where *siccas* = Ovid's *immunis aequoris, aequoris expers.*

ASTUS. Add Gell. 15. 22. in lemm. de Sertorio deque astu eius; 17. 9. 18 barbarico astu excogitata; Fronto, p. 215, 6, Naber.

AUGURIUS, A, UM (rare). Add Cic. Cato Maior, §38 ius augurium, pontificium, civile tracto.

2. CALCEATUS is cited only from Pliny the Elder and Suetonius. Add Gell. 13. 22. in lemm. In §7 of this chapter G. twice uses the classical form *calciamentum.*

CALCITROSUS. Add Petron. 39 deinde totus caelus taurulus fit. Itaque tunc calcitrosi nascuntur.

CALLUM. For the masc. form *callus* cf. Tert. Spect. 23 Tales enim cicatrices et *callos pugnorum* ... a deo ... accepit? In Suet. Aug. 80 *callis* quibusdam, cited both by L. and S. and Georges as affording an example of the masculine, I see no reason why we should not regard the word as in the neuter.

CAPTATRIX is cited once only, and then from Apuleius. Add Tert. De Cor. Mil. 13 Est enim omnis publicae laetitiae luxuria captatrix.

CAUSIDICALIS, E is cited only from a letter of Marcus Aurelius to Fronto (= Naber 68, 22). But it is read by Hertz (following a conjecture of Vogel) in Gell. 12. 2. 1, where, speaking of Seneca the philosopher, G. condemns his *res atque sententiae* as aut inepto inanique impetu aut levi et causidicali argutia. Gronovius read *quasi dicaci.*

CLAUSTRITUMUS. Correct reference in L. and S. from Laev. ap. Gell. 12, 105 to Laev. ap. Gell. 12. 10. 5. Georges wrongly ascribes the word to Livius Andronicus.

COMPECCARE is cited only from Caelius Aurelianus, but was used long before by Tert. De Idol. 14.

CONDECORE is to be added to our lexicons from Gell. 14. 4. 1 Condigne et condecore Chrysippus ... depinxit.

CONSIDERATE is not cited later than Suet. Add Gell. 9. 9. 3 scite et considerate. Cf. 2. 23. 3 considerate atque apte.

CORNU. For the by-form *cornum* add Gell. 1. 8. 2, where *cornum copiae* is a translation of κέρας 'Αμαλθείας.

CORREPTE in L. and S. is out of place, since, in accordance with the system elsewhere followed, it should come at the close of the article on *corripio*. Further, the reference to Gell. 6, 9 should be corrected to 9. 6. 3. Add also Gell. 2. 17. §§1, 5, 11. In the first of these passages it is coupled with *pronuntiare*, in the others with *dicere*, and is used of the enunciation of short vowels. It is the opposite of *producte*. For the verb *corripere* cf. Gell. l. l., §§3, 6; for the opposites *producere* and *protendere* see §§1, 4. ·

CREPIDO. The meaning *sidewalk, footpath* is not recognized by L. and S., and no exact reference is given by Georges. Compare Petron. 9 vidi Gitona in crepidine semitae stantem; Iuv. 5. 8 with Mayor's note; Rich's Dictionary, s. v.; Overbeck-Mau, Pompeii, pp. 58–60.

CUIAS, ATIS. Add Gell. 15. 30. in lemm. and §3.

CUIUS, A, UM (rel.) occurs in Gell. 1. 13. 7, 1. 22. 6, 2. 29. 15.

CUIUSCEMODI is cited but once, and then from Apuleius. Add Gell. 11. 6. 8 rerum c. plurimarum.

CUIUSMODICUMQUE is read by Hertz on good authority in Gell. 11. 18. 3 In illis legibus furem c. furti supplicio capitis poeniendum esse . . . censuit.

CUMPRIMIS. Correct the single reference given by L. and S. (s. v. I cum II D) from Gell. 1. 12. 7 to 1. 13. 7, and add Gell. 1. 15. 8, 11. 3. 1, 13. 17. 2, 13. 21. 25, 18. 4. 8, 19. 5. 3.   In 17. 2. 14 G. characterizes the word as obsolete. Cf. Wölfflin, Archiv, 1, 97.

CURRICULUM. The abl. *curriculo* is a mere adverb in Gell. 17. 8. 8 Nonne is curriculo atque oleum petis? See Lorenz on Plaut. Most. 362; Brix on Mil. 523 f.

DEPECISCOR is rare except in Cicero, but may be found at Gell. 20. 1. 38 reus, qui depecisci noluerat.

DEPINGO = *to picture by language* occurs Gell. 9. 13. in lemm. verba . . . quibus . . . pugnam depinxit; §6 verba . . . quibus pugna ista depicta est; 14. 4. in lemm.; 14. 4. 1 Condigne et condecore Chrysippus . . . severis atque venerandis verborum coloribus depinxit.

DESTILLATIO is rare. Add, therefore, Suet. Aug. 81 destillationibus iocinere vitiato.

DISPALOR is not cited from any author between Nepos and Ammianus. Add Gell. 1. 11. 4 vis et impetus militum ne sparsi dispalatique proruerent cohibebatur.

ENARRATIO = *interpretation* in Gell. 2. 16. in lemm. Caesellius Vindex . . . reprehensus est in sensus Vergiliani enarratione.

ENTHYMEMA occurs Gell. 1. 4. 2 super eo enthymemate . . . ita existimavit.

EPILOGUS is cited only from Cicero and Quintilian, but compare Gell. 14. 2. 1 adulescens a poetarum fabulis (i. e. from grammatical studies) et a rhetorum epilogis (i. e. from rhetorical studies) ad iudicandas lites vocatus.

EXPUTO = *to clean, to purify* occurs in Gell. 7. 5. 9 Argentum ergo in Carthaginiensi foedere "putum" dictum est quasi exputatum excoctumque omnique aliena materia carens omnibusque ex eo vitiis detractis emaculatum et candefactum. Gellius has thus amply defined the word himself.

EXSERTO. Add Sen. Med. 690 serpens . . . trifidam linguam exertat.

EXSPES. Add Persius 2. 50 deceptus et exspes.

EXSUCTUS (exsugo) is used of lean oysters Gell. 20. 8. 3. See below on *macriusculus*.

FACIES. Gellius discusses the early forms of the genitive of this and other words of the fifth declension in 9. 14 passim, not, as L. and S. have it, in 8. 14. 1.

FAMULATUS. A passage well worth recording is Tac. Agric. 31 sicut in familia recentissimus quisque servorum etiam conservis ludibrio est, sic in hoc orbis terrarum vetere famulatu novi nos et viles in excidium petimur.

FASTIDIO. A deponent form occurs Petron. 48 ne me putes studia fastiditum, II bybliothecas habeo.

FERIOR. For the phrase *dies feriatus* see Gell. 13. 22. 1 and Mayor on Plin. Epp. 3. 14. 6.

FESTINATIO is not cited later than Quint., but compare Gell. 15. 22. 6 cerva . . . festinatione ac tumultu consternata.

FIDICINA. Add Gell. 1. 11. in lemm. Herodotus Alyattem regem *fidicinas* in procinctu habuisse tradit. For a commentary on this sentence cf. §7 of the chapter: Alyattes . . . ut Herodotus in historia tradit, concinentes habuit fistulatores et fidicines, atque *feminas* etiam *tibicinas* in exercitu atque in procinctu habuit. Gellius has apparently misunderstood Herod. 1. 17 (’Αλυάττης) ἐστρατεύετο δὲ ὑπὸ συρίγγων τε καὶ πηκτίδων καὶ αὐλοῦ γυναικηίου τε καὶ ἀνδρηίου. *Fidicina* may be found also in the Periocha to Ter. Adel., vs. 7.[1]

---

[1] It might be maintained that in Gell., l. l., we have rather a Greek accusative plural from *fidicen*. For such a view some authority might be produced. Cf. *agona* 10. 18. 5 ; *aera* 5. 15. 7 ; *pancratiasten* 3. 15. 3 ; *problematon* 1. 11. 17 ; *pyramidas* 1. 20. 3 ; *planetes* 14. 1. 12 ; *climacteras* 3. 10. 9. However, I think the view stated above is the true one. The sentence quoted from §7 is decisive.

FIDICULA = a musical instrument in Gell. 1. 11. 8.

FILUM.   In L. and S., s. v. B 3, we read: "Gell. 1, 9, 2; Amm. 14, 11, 28; forma atque filo virginali, id. 14, 4, 2." Correct last reference to Gell. 14. 4. 2.

FINIS is feminine several times in Gellius: see for full discussion the Drisler Studies,[1] p. 150.   Postgate (Select Elegies of Propertius, p. xci) remarks that *finis* is often feminine in that author.

FLAVESCO is not cited from any prose-writer save the elder Pliny.   Add Gell. 2. 29. 5 frumentis flavescentibus.

FULIGO is wrongly defined by L. and S. as *paint* in Gell. 1. 2. 7 qui se Stoicos nuncuparent atraque verborum et argutiarum fuligine ob oculos audientium iacta sanctissimum disciplinae nomen ementirentur.   The meaning is plainly *soot*.   A somewhat similar passage is Gell. 5. 21. 4 eas (inauditiunculas) quasi pulverem ob oculos . . . adspergebat.

GENEALOGIA.   Add Tert. De Idol. 10.

GESTICULATIO.   Add Tert. Spect. 21 qui filiae virginis ab omni spurco verbo aures tuetur, ipse eam in theatrum ad illas voces gesticulationesque deducat.

GLOSSARIUM.   L. and S. cite Gell. 18. 7. 3 thus: vos philosophi meri estis, ut M. Cato ait, mortualia glossaria; namque colligitis lexidia . . .   Hertz's reading is much better: vos philosophi . . . mera estis mortualia; glosaria namque colligitis et lexidia . . .   Cf. just above in same section: nulla prorsus bonae salutis spes reliqua est, cum vos quoque, philosophorum inlustrissimi, nihil iam aliud quam verba auctoritatesque verborum cordi habetis.   *Namque* frequently stands in the second place in Gell.; cf. 2. 22. 20, 5. 10. 4, 6. 3. 18, 7. 5. 7, 9. 5. 3, 10. 6. 2, 11. 2. 2, 13. 8. 2, 13. 31. 5, 16. 2. 3, 17. 20. 9, et al.; once (10. 3. 17) it occupies the third place.   See Schmalz in Müller's Handbuch, 2², p. 466, §198.

HEPAR = *liver* is cited only from Marcellus Empiricus, but may be found Petron. 66 habuimus . . . cordae frusta et *hepatia* in catillis.

HOROLOGIUM.   Add Petron. 26.   A reference to Marquardt, Privatleben², pp. 256, 789, or some similar discussion, would be helpful.

IGNITABULUM or INCITABULUM?   L. and S., as well as Georges, cite the latter of these words as ἅπ. εἰρ. in Gell. 15. 2. 3 crebris et

---

[1] This and similar references are to the 'Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler' (Macmillan, 1894).

ingentibus poculis ingenium omne ingurgitabat, fomitem esse quendam dicens et incitabulum (?) ingenii virtutisque, si mens et corpus hominis vino flagraret. Hertz's reading, *ignitabulum*, seems to me preferable. The combination *fomitem et ignitabulum . . . flagraret* is thoroughly in accord with Gellius' habit of coupling words of closely allied meaning, and harmonizes well with his predilection for strong metaphors. Further in Macrob. Sat. 2. 8. 4 (a passage evidently based on the one under discussion) Eyssenhardt reads qui aestimavit fomitem esse quendam et ignitabulum ingenii virtutisque . . . This point was noticed by Gronovius, who himself read *incitabulum*. Finally, for the existence of a word *ignitabulum* we have independent testimony (see lexx.), whereas no authority exists for *incitabulum* apart from the present passage. I would therefore expunge *incitabulum* from the lexicons, and s. v. *ignitabulum* add reference to Gell. l. l., and s. v. *fomes* (L. and S.) correct the wording of this passage as cited there.

IMPERITE is cited only from Cic. and Quint. Add Gell. 2. 8. 8, 5. 17. 1.

INDISERTUS is cited only from Cicero, but occurs Gell. 15. 8. 1 Favoni, non indiserti viri.

INERUDITUS is cited only from Cic. and Quint. Add Gell. 18. 11. 1 Caesellio Vindice, grammatico . . . hautquaquam inerudito. For the adverb *inerudite* add Tullius Tiro ap. Gell. 6. 3. 12, an earlier instance of its use than the single example cited by L. and S. (Georges wrongly ascribes the passage to Gellius.)

INIUSSUS is not cited before Cicero, but occurs in Ter. Phorm. 231 Itane tandem uxorem duxit Antipho iniussu meo? See also Hec. 562 and 704; Cato, De Agri Cultura, V 3. It is strange that even Wölfflin (Archiv, IV 402) says that this word is not found before Cicero.

INQUINAMENTUM. Add Tert. De Idol. 10 (bis).

INTEMPESTIVE is not cited from any author later than Tacitus, but see Gell. 1. 2. 4, 4. 20. 6.

INTERNOSCO is not cited later than Cicero, but occurs in Tac. Agric. 12 finem atque initium lucis exiguo discrimine internoscas.

INTERQUIESCO (rare) bears a highly figurative sense in Gell. 2. 2. 9 in publicis locis . . . patrum iura cum filiorum, qui in magistratu sunt, potestatibus collata *interquiescere paululum et conivere.*

INTOLERANTER, cited only from Cicero and Caesar, may be found in Gell. 15. 4. 3.

INVOLUCRUM. Add Gell. 9. 15. 9 incipit . . . involucra sensuum (= expressions of unknown import) verborumque volumina vocumque turbas fundere. ·

ISOPSEPHUS, A, UM is to be added to the lexicons from Gell. 14. 6. 4 (which Liddell and Scott, s. v. ἰσόψηφος, wrongly cite as 14. 4). In §1 G. relates that one of his friends, volunteering to help him in the compilation of the Noctes Atticae, had loaned him a liber doctrinae omnigenus praescatens. In addition to many other wonderful things contained in this volume, there was a question as to what verses in Homer are *isopsephi*. Each letter of the Greek alphabet had, as is well known, a definite numerical value (cf. Hadley-Allen, §289). Hence *versus isopsephi* are verses in which the combined numerical value of all the letters is the same. Examples are Iliad 7, 264, 265, in which the sum of all the letters in each line is 3498, and Iliad 19, 306, 307, in which the sum of the numerical values of the several letters is 2848. Words too may be *isopsephi*. Thus in Νεῖλος and μένος the sum of the letter-values is 365. See further Muretus, Var. Lect. 14, 13, and Plutarch, Symposiaca 9. 3. 3.[1]

ITO, ARE. Add Gell. 2. 24. 13, 7. 6. 12.

1. JUGO = *to marry* is cited only from Catull. and Vergil. Add Hor. Carm. Saec. 18 Diva, . . . patrum prosperes decreta super iugandis feminis.

JUVENTA is cited from no author later than Tac., but see Gell. 10. 28. in lemm. Add also Livy 1. 57. 7, and cf. Weissenborn on Livy 26. 2. 15.

LAC. L. and S. wrongly say that Hertz reads *lacte* in Gell. 12, 1. 17, for there he reads praesertim si ista quam *ad praebendum lactem* adhibetis aut serva aut servilis est. For a full discussion of this masculine form see Drisler Studies, p. 151. *Lacte* as an archaic form of the nominative occurs in Gell. 19. 8. 13, a passage which has escaped even Lorenz (on Plaut. Mil. 240) and Georges.

LASANUM. A masculine form occurs in Petron. 47.

LAXAMENTUM is not cited between Seneca the philosopher and Macrob. Add Gell. 5. 1. 2 animus audientis philosophum . . . laxamentum atque otium prolixe profuseque laudandi non habet.

LECTITO is used much more frequently than the citations would indicate: see Mayor on Pliny, Epp. 3. 5. 1, and add Gell. 1. 4. 8, 1. 7. 16, 2. 23. 1, 3. 3. 1, 5. 15. 9, 9. 4. 5, 11. 13. 5.

[1] For the substance of this note I am indebted to Weiss, the translator of Gellius.

2. LENUNCULUS. Gell. 10. 25. 2 vouches for this word as one of a number of navium vocabula quae scripta in veterum libris reperiuntur.

LEVAMENTUM is not cited later than Tacitus, but occurs Gell. 12. 4. 1.

LUSCITIOSUS. There should be a reference to Gell. 4. 2. 11 De myope quoque, qui luscitiosus Latine appellatur, dissensum est.

LUX. L. and S. say that in Plautus *lux* is always masculine, supporting this statement by a reference to Brix on Capt. 5. 4. 11 (1008). In Brix's fourth edition, however, nothing is said in the note on that verse concerning the gender of this word, while in the Register, p. 115, it is merely suggested that it may be masculine. Georges, following the common view, holds that in *cum primo luci* and like phrases, *luci* is masculine. See, however, Drisler Studies, p. 144.

MACRIUSCULUS, A, UM = *lean* is not recorded by the lexicons, though it may be found in Gell. 20. 8. 3 Quae (ostreae) cum adpositae fuissent et multae quidem, sed *inuberes macriusculae*-que essent, "luna" inquit "nunc videlicet senescit; ea re ostrea ... tenuis exsuctaque est." Contrast Pliny's *ostrea multo lacte praegnatia.*

MALACIA is cited but thrice; add Gell. 19. 1. 12 malacia venti ac maris. Cf. Archiv, 6. 259, 7. 270 and 445.

MEMBRANULA II. Add Gell. 19. 10. 2 fabri aedium ... ostendebant depictas in membranulis varias species balnearum.

MINUSCULUS. Add Gell. 4. 11. 6 minusculi porculi.

MIRE. For *mire quam* see Gell. 9. 9. 4 mire quam suave. So he writes nimis quam ineptum absurdumque 14. 1. 4.

MISCELLUS. Add Gell. Praef. 5 variam et miscellam et quasi confusaneam doctrinam conquisiverant.

MONSTRUOSUS. Add Gell. 3. 16. 9 monstruosae raritates; 17. 10. 19. Macrob. 3. 17. 17.

MOROSITAS = *niceness, over-refinement,* is cited once only, from Suet. Add Gell. 1. 3. 12 anxietate et quasi morositate disputationis praetermissa.

MULTIMODUS. Add Tert. De Idol. 10 multimodae idololatriae; De Anima 52.

MUNIFICUS = *duty-doing.* Add Tert. De Cor. Mil. 12, where Tertullian, speaking of various kinds of crowns, says: Nam et castrenses appellantur, munificae et ipsae sollemnium Caesareanorum. Since crowns are so necessary to all festivals, he calls

them *office-bearers, officials,* so to speak, of the court.   Oehler quotes Cod. Theod. 12. 1. 192 spontanei hypomnetographi munifici; Isid. Origg. 10. 166 munificus dictus, vel quia alicui munera dat multa vel quia munus suum, id est officium quod debet, adimplet; Tert. De Oratione 22.

MYOPS is cited only from Ulp. Dig.   Add Gell. 4. 2. 11, quoted on *luscitiosus* above.

NECESSE.   For the by-forms *necessum, necessus* in Gell., see Drisler Studies, p. 159.

NEGATIO is cited only from Cic. and Apul., but see Tert. De Idol. 22 omnis negatio idololatria est, sicut omnis idololatria negatio est sive in factis sive in verbis.

OBIURGATIO is not cited later than Quint., but compare Gell. 1. 2. 6 obiurgatione iusta incessuit.

OBSOLETUS = *obsolete* occurs Gell. 11. 7. 1 verba obsoleta exculcataque.   Cf. verba antiquissima relictaque iam et desita of the lemma, and sermo desitus 1. 10. 2.

OLEAGINEUS.   For the corona oleaginea, worn by the procuratores triumphi, see Gell. 5. 6. 4 c. o. qua uti solent, qui in proelio non fuerunt, sed triumphum procurant.

ONERO = *to put on board ship as cargo* in Petron. 76 quinque naves aedificavi, oneravi vinum; ibid. oneravi rursus vinum, lardum, fabam, seplasium, mancipia.   See Nettleship on Verg. Aen. 1, 195.

OPILIO.   Add Gell. 16. 6. 1 de ovium dentibus opiliones percontantur (= passive).

PARVITAS.   The lexicons refer to Gell. 7 (6). 17. 2 as affording an instance of the use of this word.   Hertz, however, reads *pravitas.*

PENUS.   L. and S. write: "gen. peneris, peniteris, only according to Gell. 4, 1, 2."   So Gronovius read, but Hertz does not give *peniteris* at all, and for *peneris* reads *penoris.*

PERENDIE is cited only from Plaut. and Cicero.   Add Gell. 6. 1. 10, Fronto, page 84, lines 13 and 25, Naber.

PERPOTO is not cited from any author later than Quintus Curtius, but occurs in Gell. 6. 11. 4.

PLEBS.   A nominative *plebes* occurs in Gell. 10. 20. §§5, 6, and 17. 21. 11; a genitive *plebei* 3. 2. 11, 10. 6. in lemm. and §3; a gen. *plebi* 13. 12. 3, 15. 4. 3, 17. 21. 11.

PLERIQUE.   For the archaistic phrase *plerique omnes* in Gell. see Drisler Studies, p. 160, and to the examples there given add

p. omnia 14. 3. 1; p. omnibus 15. 7. 1; compare also Wölfflin, Lat. u. Rom. Compar., p. 41. Especially noteworthy is Gell. 10. 24. 4 pleraque omnis vetustas sic locuta est.

PLUSCULUS is cited but twice from Apuleius, though the index to the Delphin edition gives nine passages in which it occurs. No reference is made to Gellius, who uses it at 4. 17. in lemm., 9. 14. 6, 10. 29. in lemm., 13. 2. 2, 19. 9. 7. Macrob. 2. 2. 17.

POSITUS is thrice used by Gellius. Cf. 1. 2. 2 propulsabamus incommoda caloris lucorum ingentium umbra . . . aedium positu refrigeranti; 4. 17. 8 sed reddit eam (syllabam) positu longam; 10. 4. 1 Nomina verbaque non positu fortuito . . . facta esse . . . P. Nigidius docet. With *fortuito positu facta verba* we may compare *nomina positiva* of the lemma, *verba arbitraria* of §2, and θίσει as used in such discussions.

PRAELEGO I = *to read a thing to others as teacher to scholars*, twice in Martial; 1. 35. 2 Versus . . . parum severos Nec quos praelegat in schola magister; 8. 3. 15 Praelegat ut timidus rauca te voce magister Oderit et grandis virgo bonusque puer. Compare also Macrob. Sat. 1. 24. 5 videris enim mihi ita adhuc Vergilianos habere versus qualiter eos pueri magistris praelegentibus canebamus.

PRAESCATENS. L. and S. cite Gell. 14. 6. 1 as liber doctrinis omnigenis praescatens. Hertz, however, writes omnigenae doctrinae (which reading is actually followed by L. and S., s. v. omnigenus).

PRAESTANTIA is cited only from Cic. and the elder Pliny. Add Gell. 1. 1. 1.

PROMONEO occurs in Gell. 2. 29. 2.

PROPEMODUM is cited only from Cic. and Plautus. Add Ter. Phorm. 211; Gell. 2. 21. 11, 2. 22. 22, 4. 1. 8, 7. 8. 5, 9. 7. 2, 10. 27. in lemm., 12. 5. 5, 13. 17. 1. We may compare Gellius' fondness for *admodum*, which he uses about 40 times. Hertz reads *fermemodum* in 18. 12. 9 (10), for which see Drisler Studies, p. 169.

PUDEO is used with personal subject in Gell. 5. 1. 3 inter ipsam philosophi orationem et perhorrescat necesse est et *pudeat tacitus* et paeniteat et gaudeatur et admiretur. For this archaism see Lorenz on Plaut. Most. 1165, and correct West on Ter. Andr. 637 nil pudent, who says: "The personal use of this verb occurs only in the older Latin."

QUALITER = *quo modo, quem ad modum*, occurs in Tert. Spect. 2 Sed quia non penitus Deum norunt . . . necesse est ignorent

qualiter administrari aut iubeat aut prohibeat quae instituit; Macrob. Sat. 1. 24. 5 (quoted above on *praelego*), 3. 4. 1, 5. 1. 18, 6. 8. 1.

QUEO. Gellius' fondness for this verb has been noticed in the Drisler Studies, p. 146. To the passages there cited add the following: *queunt* 14. 1. 30, 16. 8. 14, 16. 13. 9, 19. 8. 14; *queat* 2. 6. 9, 12. 12. 1; *queant* 14. 1. 26 bis; *quire* 11. 9. 1; *quiret* 14. 1. 12; *quivi* 14. 2. 25; *quiverit* (subj.) 14. 1. 17.

ROBIGUS. L. and S. write: "Acc. to Ov. F. 4, 907; Tert. Spect. 15 *fin.* . . . this was a female deity and was called Robigo." Correct to Tert. Spect. 5.

RUFO, ARE is cited only from the elder Pliny, but is used by Tertull. also in a striking passage of the De Cor. Mil., chapter 1. He is speaking of the soldier who refused to wear a crown while a largess from the reigning emperors was being distributed. Part of his punishment was the loss of his military rank. Tert. proceeds: Ibidem gravissimas paenulas posuit . . . speculatoriam (caligam) . . . de pedibus absolvit . . . gladium nec dominicae defensioni necessariam reddidit . . . Et nunc *rufatus sanguinis sui spe*, calceatus de Evangelii paratura, succinctus acutiore verbo Dei . . . In *rufatus* there is an allusion to the usual color of military cloaks.

SCELERUS, A, UM. As examples of such an adjective L. and S. cite Plaut. Pseud. iii. 2. 28 (= 795 Lorenz, 817 Ritschl) sinapis scelera; ibid. v. 1. 3 (= 1037 L., 1054 R.) scelerum caput. Reference is also made by them to Serv. on Aen. 9, 486, where the existence of such an adjective is predicated. Georges speaks with a somewhat uncertain voice. In his Lex. d. lat. Wortformen, s. v. *scelerus*, he cites additional examples of *scelerum caput*, and compares *sceleratum caput* Plaut. Epid. 368. In his Handwörterbuch, however, he speaks of *scelerus* as "von Serv. Verg. Aen. 9, 486 fälschlich angenommene Wortform, da die von ihm angeführten Stellen aus Plaut. zu scelus gehören . . ." This latter view is certainly the correct one: see Lorenz on Plaut. Mil. 494, Brix on Mil. 495; Morris on Pseud. 817, Lorenz on Pseud. 795; Plaut. Rud. 1098, where *scelerum caput* and *periuri caput* are used together. Sonnenschein ad loc. cites Shakespere's "head and front of offending." Note also the phrase *scelus viri*, for which see Plaut. Truc. ii. 7. 60, and Mil. 1434, Lorenz, with his note. *Scelerus*, therefore, should be expunged from our lexicons.

SELIBRA. Add Gell. 6. 18. 2 argenti pondo libram et selibram.

SENECTUS, A, UM.   For *senecta aetas* add Gell. 2. 15. in lemm. and 3. 4. in lemm.

SIGNIFICANTER.   Add Tert. Spect. 3 se in incertum constituit quod non s. neque nominatim denuntietur servis Dei abstinentia eiusmodi.

STERICULA and STERILICULA are both cited by L. and S. from one passage only, Petron. 35, where Buecheler reads *sterilicula*. *Stericula* should therefore be expunged.

STERILIS, E.   The by-form *sterilus, a, um* occurs also in Gell. 17. 21. 44 Carvilius ... divortium cum uxore fecit quod sterila esset.

SUMME.   Add Gell. Praef. 12 vir summe nobilis; 11. 11. 1 quem M. Cicero ... summe reveritus est.

SUPERSTITIOSE = *too scrupulously, too nicely, too exactly*, occurs in Gell. 1. 25. 10 non id Varronis negotium fuit ut indutias s. definiret; 3. 19. 3 s. et nimis moleste atque odiose confabricatus ... est originem vocabuli.

TEMPESTAS often = *time, point of time, period of time* in Gellius. See Drisler Studies, p. 154.

TRANSLATIO = *a figure, trope* in Gell. 16. 5. 11 Meminisse debebimus id vocabulum non semper a veteribus scriptoribus proprie, sed per quasdam translationes dictum esse.

TRIGON.   In all the passages cited by L. and S. and Georges, this word is said to have reference to the game of ball.   In Gell. 2. 21. 10 it is a term of mathematics and denotes the triangle: Varro addit dubitare sese an propterea magis hae septem stellae triones appellatae sint quia ita sunt sitae, ut ternae stellae proximae quaeque inter sese faciant trigona, id est, triquetras figuras.

UNANIMITAS (very rare).   Add Tert. De Idol. 13.

VENTITO.   Add Gell. 3. 13. 1, 6. 1. 6, 12. 11. 1.

2. VERBERO is cited by L. and S. only from Plaut. and Terence, but occurs in Gell. 1. 26. 8.

VERSUTE (rare).   Add Gell. 5. 10. 16 captio v. excogitata.

VOMITIO is cited only from Cicero and the elder Pliny, but may be found in Gell. 17. 15. 4 stomachum et ventrem superiorem vomitionibus purgari.

BARNARD COLLEGE, NEW YORK.   CHARLES KNAPP.

NOTES.

Totus in Old French and Provençal.

It is intended to present here a brief historical review of the development of the Modern French word *tout*.

Its declension in the oldest stage of the language is as follows:

toz	*tuit*
tot	*toz*.

The history of these forms has been thus far looked upon as very dark: the final *t* points back to a Latin form with a double *t*; a single *t* should have fallen. Indeed, in his Italienische Grammatik (§263), M. Meyer-Lübke states as a fact that "already in Vulgar Latin *tottus* appears by the side of *totus*," and his opinion is also that of many scholars.

tottus, however, is still considered as a doubtful form, and various attempts have been made to explain it. Gröber, in Wölfflin's Archiv, vol. VI, p. 129, suggests that it may be due to a tautological use of the word, as in Modern Italian *pian-piano*. **tottotus*, therefore, would be our starting-point. Several objections have been raised against this form, the most weighty of all being that the fall of the tonic vowel in *tutto*, French *tout*, is wholly inadmissible. Moreover, even if *tottus* was accepted, all the difficulties would not disappear.

Another explanation for the Italian form *tutto*, and one that is more plausible, is briefly indicated in Körting's Wörterbuch, viz. the double *t* can be accounted for from the proclitic use of the word before a vowel-sound. We would have, for instance, *tot(o) anno* > *tottánno*, as we have *tot(a) hora* > *tuttóra*, *e(t) bene* > *ebbene*. *tutto* would be thus far explained; but no satisfactory reason has yet been offered in regard to the change of vowel. The Latin *ō* cannot regularly give a *u* in Italian or in any of the Romance languages.

It is rather surprising that an immediate cause for that phonetic disturbance should not have been thought of in connection with one of the phonetic phenomena that are everywhere of frequent

occurrence. I am alluding here to dissimilation. The final Latin *ŭ* becoming regularly *ǫ* in Italian, it is quite easy to understand why the tonic *ǫ* changed to *u* when followed by a sound of the same nature, particularly if we lend attention to the fact that a closed *ǫ* is frequently pronounced with a *u* glide. English *so*, for instance. The change of *ǫ>u* must of course have taken place before the doubling of the consonant, and the different steps through which the word passed would be thus : *totum>totǫ>tuto* +voc.>*tutto*.

Since *tutto* is a special Italian form, it may not be amiss to suggest that, Italy being the last stronghold of the Latin language, the country where the Latin tongue held its own for the longest time, this dissimilation may have been further helped by the fact that the popular language endeavored also to establish a distinction between its own oblique case and the Latin dative.

I have thus far disposed of the objections that may be based on the Italian word and cleared the ground for the consideration of the French forms. I venture to express the opinion that they are all derived from the regular Latin forms, and that the apparent irregularities they offer are entirely due to phonetic causes.

And first of all, one thing is already certain, viz. that the Spanish and Portuguese forms are regularly derived from the Latin. If from this territory we go over to the Provençal districts, we are confronted with a marked phonetic tendency that up to this day is one of the most conspicuous traits of Southern dialects : it is that of using very frequently voiceless dental stops as endings and the presence of a *t* often where it does not etymologically belong. This peculiarity is the subject of a note by M. Paul Meyer in the VIIth vol. of the Romania, p. 107, under the title 'D'un emploi non étymologique du *t* final en Provençal,' and it is sufficient to look over some old Provençal texts to ascertain that a *t* may frequently be found where it does not etymologically belong. Bearing this in mind, we may easily admit that *totus* did not give in Provençal **tos*, as it should have given, but *toz*, owing to this fondness for voiceless dental stops, which I believe asserts itself particularly in monosyllables; and of course the explanation would hold the same in the case of *totum>tot*.[1]

In regard to M. Gaston Paris's remark in Romania, X, p. 42, that **tottum* must have existed, since we have *ou* instead of *eu* in

---

[1] *antius>anz* presents a development exactly similar.

the Modern French word, I think that M. Gaston Paris himself
would cheerfully concede that the same development occurs in
quite a number of words, owing to their unaccented position in
the stress-group; cf. *nos* and *vos*, that have given in French *nous*,
vous.

We may also add that in French likewise, under certain con-
ditions, the final *t* does remain.   In *soit*<*sit*, for instance, because
the word is often used alone and frequently with great emphasis.
Ex.: *Soit!* = Let it be so!   May I be allowed to allude here to
the familiar ' C'est clair et *net* comme clarinette'?

Now, I hold that the French forms were directly influenced by
the Provençal, and this becomes clearer as we come to look at the
plural form: Latin *toti*, French *tuit*, Provençal *tuit*, *tuith*, *tuih*,
tuich.   In the first place, we have here again the change of *ō*>*u*;
but this has been satisfactorily explained by Förster (Zeit. für
rom. Phil. III, p. 498).   Latin *ō* was umlauted by the final *i*.
The only thing left to be explained is the presence of the *i* before
the *t*; and the solution of what has been thus far considered as a
riddle is given by the study of certain Provençal sounds.

In an article contained in Romania, XIV, p. 289, in which he
reviews the work of Mr. F. Armitage, 'Sermons du XIIe siècle
en vieux Provençal publiés d'après le mss 3548 de la Bibliothèque
Nationale,' M. Paul Meyer calls our attention to some purely
linguistic questions that are raised by the text published.   One
of them is the peculiarity of ending with the letter *h* a certain
number of past participles in the nominative plural; for instance,

<div align="center">

amatus>*amatz*   *amati*>*amah*
amatum>*amat*   *amatos*>*amatz*;

</div>

and he points out the fact that there is but one ending for the
singular subject and plural object, while the singular object and
the plural subject have each an ending of their own; and also
that the ending *ati* of the Latin plural nominative gives in
Romance a different result than the ending *atum* of the accu-
sative singular.   He goes on and states that in certain texts
(Hte. Garonne, Aude, Tarn, Aveyron) the *i* of the nominative
plural is preserved, and gives numerous examples to bear out his
statement.

A little further he adds: "In other territories, particularly in
Quercy, the *i*, instead of forming an atonic syllable at the end of
the word, *was joined to the tonic syllable* . . .; the result for the

Latin ending was either *aih* or *aig* . . . *The same fact is observed in the Provençal tuih, tug, French tuit.*" Here M. Paul Meyer refers to an article by M. Jules Cornu contained in Romania, vol. VII, p. 360, under the title 'De l'influence régressive de l'*i* atone sur les voyelles toniques,' from which we may quote the following : "In *tuit* the attraction exactly similar to that which we know in a good many other words is plainly evident, and it is not the less so in *oi*, one of the forms of the imperative of *oir* ; for *audi* could give *oi* only through *odii*>*odji*>*ojdji*. One might be tempted to think that the doubling of the *i* that is admitted in order to explain *tuit* and *oi* is a pure hypothesis that does not rest upon any documentary evidence ; but in the translation of the Gospel of St. John we find *tramesii, diissii, dissii, fezii*, that give to it a solid foundation."

I take the liberty of somewhat altering the formula given above, since in the case of *toti* M. Cornu accepts the double *t*, for which we have no use, and we have then *tutii*>*tutji*>*tujtji*.

Since it is quite superfluous to repeat for *tuit* what has already been said in connection with the final *t* for *tot*, we may conclude in saying that the last difficulty has now vanished away ; and I hope to have fully established what I set out to prove, viz. that the Old French declension of modern *tout* in all its forms derives entirely from the regular Latin forms, and that the peculiarities they offer are partly due to phonetic causes and largely to Provençal influence.

The oldest French text in which *tuit* occurs is the Cantilena of St. Eulalia, in the 25th line :

Tuit oram que por nos degnet preier.

The form *oram*, as Diez says, "ist eins der willkommensten." It shows, first, that at the date of the poem the 1st pers. plur. in French still agreed with the Latin ending, and that the sweeping analogy to *sumus* was not yet a general one. On the other hand, it proves also that the French imperative goes back to the present of indicative and not to the subjunctive ; but what is of more immediate interest to us for the subject we are dealing with, *oram* is also a Provençal form !

Indeed, Provençal is the background towards which we have to turn our eyes in order to see many words in their true light. As an organic whole, it is the oldest in date of the neo-Latin languages. The Strassburg oaths are decidedly Southern in

their linguistic coloring, and another of our oldest monuments, 'La Passion du Christ,' is a mixture of French and Provençal.

It is therefore legitimate, in the present instance, to admit this influence, and it is gratifying to note that in this case old texts do support an argument that is based upon a dialectic fact.

CHICAGO, *Oct. 22, 1894.*   RENÉ DE POYEN-BELLISLE.

NOTES ON THUCYDIDES, I 8. 1; I 9. 3; I 28. 3.

Thucydides, in speaking of the purification of Delos by the Athenians, says (I 8. 1) that over half of the dead buried in the island were found to be Carians, γνωσθέντες. τῇ τε σκευῇ τῶν ὅπλων ξυντεθαμμένῃ καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ ᾧ νῦν ἔτι θάπτουσιν. This Jowett renders: "They were known by the fashion of their arms which were buried with them, and by their mode of burial, the same which is still practised among them." If this were what Thucydides intended to say, he would naturally have written, if the word σκευή could mean fashion in the sense attributed to it by Jowett, τῇ τε σκευῇ τῶν ὅπλων τῶν ξυντεθαμμένων κτέ., for it is the arms, not the fashion of the arms, that were buried. The note in Morris's edition reads: "ξυντεθαμμένῃ: attrib. to σκευῇ," referring to c. 7, §1, where an attributive participle is placed after its noun without repetition of the article, and to a note on c. 11, §3, which reads: "Thuc. often places an attrib. partic. after a noun which is attended by other modifiers. Cf. c. 90. 7; 96. 8; III 54. 18; 56. 5; 67. 11. So Dem. XX 76, ταῦτα ἐλάττω φανῆναι τῆς ἐν ἑκάστῳ νῦν περὶ αὐτοῦ δόξης ὑπαρχούσης. XVIII 126." This note implies the same interpretation as Jowett's translation.

The correct interpretation is given in Stahl's note: "agniti habitu armorum, seu armatura quippe quae cum iis sepulta esset." Stahl cites some instances of the use of σκευή in a sense similar to that which he assigns to it here, but he does not go far enough. In fact, I have not found any instance of σκευή in the sense of *fashion.* It means everywhere in Thucydides, and, so far as I have been able to discover, in every other author, *equipment, costume, outfit,* and the like, i. e. not merely the *fashion* of arms, garments, ornaments, etc., but the objects themselves, so that σκευὴ τῶν ὅπλων means *outfit of arms* or *military outfit.* This statement is sufficiently confirmed by looking up the references

in L. and S.'s Lexicon, or those in Stephanus' Thesaurus. Stahl
at the end of his note cites the opinion of Campe, obs. crit., p. 10
sq., "that the Carians were recognized by the mere fact that their
arms were found in the graves; for the Greeks were not accus-
tomed to bury arms with their dead." This opinion of Campe
is correct if applied to the Greeks of the time of Thucydides; at
least, it is supported by modern excavations. In the Mitth. d. k.
deut. arch. Inst., Athens, 1893, pp. 73–191, Brueckner and Pernice
describe in detail the cemetery just outside the walls of Athens.
In graves of the 'Dipylon period,' which cannot reach down
lower than the end of the seventh century B. C., some blades of
swords and daggers and some spearheads were found, but the
later graves are without weapons. As these investigators say
(p. 147), "wir wüssten kein späteres attisches Grab, in welchem
Waffen gefunden worden wären." They cautiously limit their
statement to Attic graves, though this limitation is hardly neces-
sary, as scientific investigation of graves of the classical period
is almost confined to Attica. In the Mitth., 1886, pp. 15–46,
F. Dümmler describes and discusses remains of pre-Hellenic
population in the Cyclades, taking his data from graves at
Amorgos and Melos. In these graves a few isolated daggers
and spearheads were found, and, according to report, a silver
helmet was found in a grave at Amorgos some thirty years
before. Dümmler very properly says that if the population of
these islands was Carian, we should expect, according to Thucy-
dides, "eine reiche regelmässige Beilage von Waffen," and partly,
as it appears, because such a rich deposit of weapons is lacking,
he is inclined to assign these graves to Leleges. At any rate,
Dümmler seems to understand Thucydides to mean what an
unprejudiced reader would naturally gather from his words, that
the Carians were recognized by the fact that their military outfit
was buried with them. It is perhaps worth while to mention that
Blümner's statement in Baumeister's Denkmäler, article 'Bestat-
tung,' p. 305, to the effect that weapons were buried in the graves
of the Greeks, needs correction.

Thucydides, I 9. 3, after having told how the Pelopidae gained
their power, proceeds: ἅ μοι δοκεῖ Ἀγαμέμνων παραλαβὼν καὶ ναυτικῷ τε
ἅμα ἐπὶ πλέον τῶν ἄλλων ἰσχύσας τὴν στρατείαν οὐ χάριτι τὸ πλεῖον ἢ φόβῳ
ξυναγαγὼν ποιήσασθαι. The difficulty lies in καὶ ναυτικῷ τε ἅμα. Here
Classen regarded τε as the conjunction, taking καὶ—ἅμα not as a
copula, but as an adverb emphasizing the new element of power.

Krüger, v. Herwerden and Böhme omit τε. Stahl reads δέ for τε, as does also Herbst, Philol. XXIV, p. 720. Shilleto renders τε 'too,' and Jowett, in a long note on this passage, pronounces in favor of the same rendering. As the clearest examples of καί—τε occurring in the same clause, Jowett quotes VI 44. 3 and VIII 68. 2. In the first instance Jowett himself, in his note on the passage, suggests that the τε may be a correlative of δέ, at the beginning of the next sentence. The same explanation is possible in the second case, where, however, Haacke, followed by Krüger and others, changes τε to δέ. Jowett does not make the use of τε in the sense of 'too' very probable for Thucydides, and it seems to me that Herbst's objections to Classen's interpretation are well founded. I am inclined, therefore, to believe that καὶ πεζῷ or the like has fallen out, or possibly was originally intended and never written. This is a desperate solution of the difficulty, but perhaps as easy as any.

The Corcyraeans, in their speech at Corinth, offered to leave their differences to the decision of the god at Delphi, and protested against war, εἰ δὲ μή, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀναγκασθήσεσθαι ἔφασαν (Thuc. I 28. 3), ἐκείνων βιαζομένων, φίλους ποιεῖσθαι οὓς οὐ βούλονται, ἑτέρους τῶν νῦν ὄντων μᾶλλον, ὠφελίας ἕνεκα. No doubt, so far as I know, has ever been expressed as to the text. But interpretations are various. If μᾶλλον were omitted, all would be easy, but μᾶλλον can hardly have got into the text by mistake, and must therefore be explained. Arnold's note reads: "'to gain friends of a very different nature from their present associates,' that is, from the exiles of Epidamnus, with whom they were then acting in concert." He seems to regard μᾶλλον as an intensive adding force to ἑτέρους, a use for which there appears to be no precedent. Krüger explains ἑτέρους as the Athenians and τῶν νῦν ὄντων as the Peloponnesians. On μᾶλλον he quotes Gottleber, translating μᾶλλον *vielmehr* and adding "mit Stephanus auf ποιεῖσθαι zu beziehen." But μᾶλλον ποιεῖσθαι is incomprehensible unless φίλους ἑτέρους be included. Stahl says: "ἑτέρους τῶν νῦν ὄντων μᾶλλον, alios potius quam qui tunc essent." He mentions the opinion of Arnold and Goeller that the present friends are the Epidamnians and others in the neighborhood of Corcyra, but adds that perhaps the Peloponnesians are intended, because, although the Corcyraeans were not enrolled in the Peloponnesian alliance, the memory of their common origin was not lost, and they preserved some friendship with them as Dorians, for which reason the Lacedae-

monians and Sicyonians had accompanied them to Corinth. He
then concludes: "ceterum μᾶλλον, *potius*, ad φίλους ποιεῖσθαι ἑτέρους
pertinet; futurum enim esse aiunt ut cogantur alios potius amicos
sibi conciliare." The only trouble with this is, that μᾶλλον is really
not accounted for. ἑτέρους τῶν νῦν ὄντων (parallels for ἑτέρους with
genitive are given by Stahl, Krüger and others) without μᾶλλον
means 'alios potius quam qui tunc essent.' Morris's note says
nothing about μᾶλλον, but gives references for the genitive depend-
ing on ἑτέρους, and explains that τῶν νῦν ὄντων "refers rather to the
Lacedaemonians and Sicyonians, who were with them, than to
the Illyrians, whom they would hardly call φίλοι." This last,
which is also Stahl's opinion, is certainly correct, though not
because they would object to calling the Illyrians φίλοι, but
because the Corcyraeans wish to imply a threat that they will turn
from their natural allies, the Peloponnesians, to the Athenians.
And it seems to me that μᾶλλον helps this meaning and is other-
wise useless. "We," they say, "shall be forced to make friends
other than (i. e. different from) those who are now more (μᾶλλον)
our friends," i. e. other than the Peloponnesians, who are more
our friends by race and nature than are the Athenians, although
we are not (31, §2) members of any alliance. The word μᾶλλον
governs φίλων (supplied from the preceding φίλους) ὄντων.

<div align="right">Harold N. Fowler.</div>

Notes on Aristophanes' Clouds.

ΜΑΘ.   ἐχθὲς δέ γ᾽ ἡμῖν δεῖπνον οὐκ ἦν ἑσπέρας.
ΣΤΡ.   εἶεν· τί οὖν πρὸς τἄλφιτ᾽ ἐπαλαμήσατο;
ΜΑΘ.   κατὰ τῆς τραπέζης καταπάσας λεπτὴν τέφραν,
        κάμψας ὀβελίσκον, εἶτα διαβήτην λαβὼν—
        ἐκ τῆς παλαίστρας θυμάτιον ὑφείλετο.
ΣΤΡ.   τί δῆτ᾽ ἐκεῖνον τὸν Θαλῆν θαυμάζομεν;

<div align="right">—vv. 175–180.</div>

G. Hermann first brought a measure of sense into this passage
by his happy conjecture of θυμάτιον in line 179 for θοἰμάτιον of the
MSS, noting the sacrifice alluded to in Plato, Lysis 206 E. With
θυμάτιον we have actual meat, and so we may put aside the scholia
and the numberless interpretations founded on the MSS reading.
Blaydes, indeed, reverts to θοἰμάτιον (1890, θυμ. 1886), but with

no fresh light or persuasiveness. Teuffel-Kähler (1887), after Thiersch, exchanges τραπέζης, 177, and παλαίστρας, 179: which is plausible enough from his point of view, but fatally perverse, if the explanation to be given is correct. Kock (4th ed., 1894) suspects a lacuna after 178, and views the passage as still far from clear.

From the general character of the scene, 143 on, we are led to expect here a climax of wit—on the one hand a broad caricature of the scientist, on the other some absurd imposition on the simplicity of Strepsiades. Socrates standing near the altar in the palaestra and mesmerizing his pupils, and of course any altar attendant and all loiterers, over a mathematical demonstration, while he slips aside and secures some meat, is an explanation tolerable only in case no better can be found. As a humorous invention it does not strike our imagination as either brilliant or practicable.

A proper understanding of this passage has been obscured, I think, by two misconceptions—first, of the scene, and, secondly, of the *modus operandi*. The scene is the *school* itself,[1] to which the stage Socrates and his pupils are narrowly confined. They do not take walks abroad (198–9). The audience must assume the school as the scene, for the palaestra is not mentioned till the end. The method is *sorcery*. Socrates of the play stands for every sort of sophist and theosophist, physicist, charlatan and wizard.[2] See the list, lines 331–3. Belief in witchcraft was universal. Strepsiades goes to the school strong in the belief that the Black Art is practised and taught there. At 189 he bids the absorbed pupils not to expend psychic force on locating truffles, for he as a countryman has practical knowledge where to dig for them; but at 215 in terror he bids them conjure Sparta further away on the map. φροντίζειν he takes for the technical term. Power to move things through space is the familiar mark of the sorcerer. Strepsiades is constantly, though vainly, seeking a sign. In despair at 749 he proposes to buy a Thessalian witch, whose power was proverbial.

---

[1] Reisig emphasizes this, Nub. praef., p. 24, and Fritzsche approves, Adversaria, I, p. 7. Süvern conceives Socrates as suddenly (l. 178) leaving the school and his absorbed pupils to 'filch the cloak'—Ueber Aristoph. Wolken, p. 22, Eng. tr.

[2] "Comme le Démon de l'Écriture, le Socrate des Nuées s'appelle Légion." Saint Victor, Les Deux Masques.

Turning to the passage, 133–80, we see that the underlying motive of the whole is a lampoon upon the scientists. In form, however, we have an older pupil playing upon the verdancy of the newcomer, telling him big stories, lies, not necessarily to be taken as true or possible by the audience, but suited to the credulity and the mental attitude of Strepsiades. To fix attention and facilitate ready apprehension, the comedian introduces each jest by a statement of topic, then an eager question from Strepsiades, and follows it by some comment iterating and emphasizing the point of the jest, e. g. lines 169–70, 174. The bucolic flavor of this last sally puts Strepsiades in great good humor. He catches eagerly at the new problem. ἐπαλαμήσατο becomes a cue word, suggesting legerdemain. The recourse is to magic, mathematical magic, practical geodesy, the distance-taking of the famous geometer Thales extended to taking things from a distance. The skewer is used, doubtless, on account of its strong natural affinity for meat. For 'occult sympathies' and magic generally, Lucian's Philopseudes has much in point. In art Urania holds the compasses. ὑφαιρεῖν was a mathematical term, with good punning possibilities, 'subtract,' 'abstract.'

To translate :

> PUPIL. 'Last night at supper-time we had no food.
> STREPS. I see. Now tell me quick his trick for bread.
> P. Upon the table some fine dust he spread,
> Next bent a skewer, made dividers neat—

[No lacuna, but a solemn pause; a few silent gestures, twirling the imaginary compasses, drawing lines, taking directions, and finally pointing off through the air—triumphantly.]

> From the *Palaestra* he deduced our meat.
> S. 'Tis wonderful! Old Thales is outdone.'

The allusion to Thales now gets a better point. He is apostrophized not as the wise man, but as the geometer who calculated eclipses and in the popular belief taught the Egyptians how to take the height of their pyramids (Plutarch, Conv. S. Sap. 2). It is as if an American should appeal to Ben Franklin not as Poor Richard, but in his great act, *eripuit fulmen caelo.*

Readers have always lacked the significant gestures which made this scene plain to the spectators, and then the early itacistic corruption of θυμάτιον turned all astray. Surely we now get for the passage a better sense; that is, a funnier, more intelligible nonsense.

Line 73. Felton alone among editors makes the wife subject of ἐπίθετο. This view deserves fuller consideration.

The son is dropped at line 40. The passage following runs upon the mother's ways and influence. There is no syntactical reason for returning to the son before line 77, where the deictic pronoun is used to re-introduce him. It becomes, then, a question of humorous intent.

The son imbibes a passion for horses with his mother's milk. She inserts 'horse' in the name; teaches the baby to 'ride a cock-horse,' and prattles of future horses and chariots and parades. She treats with silent contempt Strepsiades' counter-prophecy with its indirect rebuke, sample of many another (cf. 54–5),

> ' To this and all I said she gave no heed,
> But with horse-fever infected all I own.'

The taint was congenital. The mother is responsible.

Line 1474. Dindorf, Meineke, Kock, Blaydes, reject this line, as the insertion of some one who imagined from τουτονὶ the presence of an earthen jar (δῖνος). Kock is very positive, and further, with Meineke, reads τουτονὶ, i. e. Socrates, which is metrically undesirable; and in the absence of Socrates 'that man's Dinos' is no improvement on 'that Dinos.' Teuffel-Kähler retains the line, but denies the *presence* of the jar.

If there be no jar, the punning allusion is certainly hard to defend. Yet τουτονὶ seems hardly to furnish an adequate motive for composing a line and inserting it in the text. Moreover, there are no further difficulties, if the presence of a jar can be justified.

The scholiast misleads us by suggesting a jar, as a figure of Dinos, in the school of Socrates. This is properly recognized as every way improbable. Besides, Strepsiades at 1473 is still before his own door. Now, Strepsiades has statues in his own house—one of Poseidon (83), one of Hermes at his house-gate (1478; cf. Thucyd. VI 27), and perhaps also one of Zeus (1234). We are by no means to suppose with the scholiast on 381 that Strepsiades really confounds the new divinity with a jar. But no commentator seems to have discerned what 'a very excellent, good-conceited thing' it is to make STREPSIADES, thoroughly disabused of his faith in the old gods, in the final act (1131 on) show pedestaled at his house-gate no longer a Zeus or a Hermes, but a big earthen δῖνος—as his best attempt to figure forth the new cosmic deity 'Volution' 'in the marble undecaying,' not his

god, but a statue of his god. Fancy the spectators' delight at this pun in statuary. The invention is Strepsiades' own: Socrates has nothing to do with it.

At 1472 Strepsiades undergoes a revulsion of feeling; catching sight of his Δîνος statue, he smashes it into bits (1473-4), re-erects his prostrate Hermes, and before it bends the knee in prayer (1478 ff.).

Such a piece of scenic cartooning is quite in Aristophanes' manner. Is it not what the spectator saw?

PRINCETON. S. R. WINANS.

SOME PLACES IN THE PHILOBIBLON OF RICHARD DE BURY.

I.

Ac dum forum suffertur a laico, a librorum alumno clerico mors differtur.—Cap. IV.

Forum suffertur is the reading supplied by the best manuscript of Philobiblon (Royal 8. F. XIV in the British Museum), against *forum transfertur* in the other copies. The correctness of *suffertur* is so evident as to need no special argument, inasmuch as the whole point of the sentence and context is the contrast between the scholar, or 'clerk,' who could prove 'his clergy' by reading some verse from the Psalter, thus saving his neck, and the layman who endured sentence of the civil court. I have had trouble, however, in finding expressions illustrating the phrase *forum suffertur*. Still, here is one which serves admirably to explain it by a converse form, *forum declinare*. It occurs in a sentence of Odofred of Bologna (died 1265), who antedates Richard de Bury by nearly a century. The passage is preserved in Sarti (De claris Archigymnasii Professoribus, Bononiae, 1769, I 94, note *b*), and reads:

Vidi hoc in civitate ista (= Bononia) tempore domini Azonis, quod scholares poterant declinare forum in causa criminali, et erant hic tunc temporis X milia scholares.

II.

Omnis artifex manualis hyperduliam propriam suis exhibet instrumentis.—Cap. IV.

De Bury, arguing from the reverence a true artisan feels for the tools of his craft, concludes the clergy should feel likewise toward

books.   But he uses a strong term (*hyperdulia*), which means
more than *dulia*, the reverence due to saints, and falls short of
latria alone, the worship due to God.   *Hyperdulia*, or the
highest reverence, is explained by Thomas Aquinas: Speciali
nomine hyperdulia nominatur, quasi superdulia (super duliam?)
ad latriam accedens (Comm. in Lib. IV Sententiarum, Lib. III,
dist. 9, art. 2).   It is suitably exercised toward the human nature
of Christ, as the context of the citation states, or toward the
Virgin (Summa Theol., Secunda secundae, Q. 103, art. 4).   So
exalted is the reverence de Bury exacts of the clergy toward
'holy books.'

<h3 style="text-align:center">III.</h3>

O beate Deus Deorum in Syon, quantus impetus fluminis voluptatis laeti-
ficavit cor nostrum, quotiens paradisum mundi Parisius visitare vacavimus
moraturi.—Cap. VIII.

The word-play between *Parisius* and *paradisus* is an easy one,
and De Bury, with his fondness for such tricks of sound, might
readily be guessed to be its inventor.   But the expression is
found in earlier writers.   Budinszky has preserved two instances
in his 'Die Universität Paris und die Fremden an derselben im
Mittelalter.'   One is in a verse by Alexander Neckham (died
1217):

> Parisius quidam, paradisus deliciarum.
>
> —Budinszky, p. 5, note 10.

The other is in a letter of Lanfranc of Milan, who came to Paris
about 1294:

O Parisius, propter regiae majestatis sedem, propter curialis speciei excel-
lentiam, propter honoris habundantiam, propter philosophorum intelligentiam
merito paradisus nuncupari potes.—Budinszky, p. 7, note 21.

Princeton, *September*, 1894.   ANDREW F. WEST.

<h3 style="text-align:center">HORACE, EP. I vi, 49–52.</h3>

> Si fortunatum species et gratia praestat,
> Mercemur servum qui dictet nomina, laevum
> Qui fodicet latus et cogat *trans pondera* dextram
> Porrigere.

The meaning of TRANS PONDERA has always been in doubt.
The scholiast speaks of PONDERA as the stepping-stones across

the streets (such as are to be seen in Pompeii). The older commentators suggested the shop-counters, on which the weights stood; the equilibrium of the body (VLTRA AEQVILIBRIVM CORPORIS CVM PERICVLO CADENDI, Gesner); obstacles in general; and even carts loaded with merchandise!

Modern editors lean to the old view, that the PONDERA were stepping-stones; but Wickham gives expression to the sentiment of all, I think, when he says: "There is no other ground [than the statement of the scholiast] for thinking that PONDERA was a technical name for these stepping-stones, and it may be a guess as baseless as others."

Important additional evidence, overlooked, as it seems, by all, is, however, to be found in a fragmentary inscription of the year 656 A. V. C. from Capua (C. I. L. I 570 and X 3789), where, after a list of names followed by a break, we have: ... HAEC · PONDERA · ET · PAVIMENTVM · FACIENDVM · ET ... (COERAVERE). The juxtaposition of PONDERA and PAVIMENTVM affords strong additional evidence of the correctness of the scholiast's view.

GEORGE N. OLCOTT.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus, edited with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Exegetical and Critical Notes, Bibliography and Indexes, by ALFRED GUDEMAN. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1894. Pp. cxxxviii + 447.

It never rains but it pours, in philology it would seem as well as in proverb! After years of lament that the Dialogus has not been accessible to our students except in German editions, with the result, of course, that by the great majority the work has been practically unread and unappreciated, of a sudden we are overwhelmed with a wealth of material for its study scarcely afforded to any other work of Tacitus, or indeed to any other literary monument of antiquity. Peterson's edition, summarizing with much soberness of judgment the most important results of German studies, was followed in less than a year by the book which engages our attention here, while almost simultaneously the work was made accessible for college instruction in the concise and admirable edition of Bennett. It was high time that something should be done to rescue from neglect in England and America this lovely child of Roman genius, which seems to have suffered in attention and regard from the wholly unwarrantable suspicion which rested for so long upon its parentage. It is hardly conceivable now, and it will be still less so when these new editions have brought the work to the appreciation which it deserves, that only a few years ago Messrs. Church and Brodribb should feel called on to make a quasi-apology for associating the Dialogus with the Germania and Agricola in their translation of the minor works, assuring their readers "that it has a certain amount of interest, as it touches on the Roman education of the period," and that it is, moreover, "thoroughly worth reading." However, all that is a thing of the past, and with the thorough and inviting guidance which is now afforded, the Dialogus will gain new friends and cause old ones to think still better of it.

Of the editions named, Professor Gudeman's is by far the most ambitious and complete. He has made a more exhaustive use of the labors of his predecessors, and has contributed more from his own resources. The editor has evidently striven to satisfy every reasonable demand that can be made of an edition of an ancient literary work, and has neglected neither the questions of a more general introductory nature, which naturally confront the reader or which (like the question of authorship) have grown up about the work as critical accretions, nor the more specific requirements of the *recensio, emendatio* and *interpretatio*. In all of these sections of the book there is much that is new and stimulating: some old problems have been solved, others have been advanced toward a solution, if not actually disposed of, while not a few entirely new points of view have been disclosed and contribute to a deeper understanding of the work. In so large a mass of matter and where so

decisive a stand is taken toward almost every question involved, criticism will inevitably be provoked. Indeed, I fear that the editor's manner of presentation is sometimes calculated to awaken a feeling of opposition in his readers, and I suspect that occasionally he has defeated his own purpose or the interests of a good argument by himself assuming too vigorously the character of an advocate and by summoning evidence for cumulative effect which were better let alone.

The first sixty-three pages of the Prolegomena are devoted to the question of authorship. Some will doubtless criticise as needless such fullness of treatment of a subject which has been looked upon for the past fifty years as practically settled in favor of Tacitus; and yet the question of date, about which the controversy has more recently raged, is so inextricably interwoven with the whole matter, and the stylistic argument has been placed on so new and different a foundation by the Lexicon Taciteum, that it is easy to comprehend the difficulty of combining brevity with thoroughness. There is much here that tempts the reviewer's pen, both to praise and to criticise. But to confine myself to more important points, and especially those where the editor has presented new views, it is interesting to observe his treatment of the point which was formerly believed (and is still by Teuffel-Schwabe, Schanz, Blass and others) to be the decisive evidence of Tacitean authorship—I mean the supposed reference to the Dialogus by Pliny in the words *itaque poemata quiescunt (crescunt* Mommsen) *quae tu inter nemora et lucos commodissime perfici putas* (IX 10; cf. Dial. 9, 29 and 12, 1). Now, the genuineness of the Dialogus is defended with a spirit and vigor almost incredible in the case of a question which has practically ceased to be discussed, and one might therefore have imagined that this argument would have been made to yield all there is in it. Not so, however. The editor's impartiality here becomes belligerent, and so far from granting to it decisive force, he holds that the inference commonly drawn from the parallelism is 'wholly fallacious and to be rejected peremptorily.' I do not think, however, that many will agree with most of the reasons adduced (p. xviii, note) for denying any significance to Lange's observation. The second of them, viz. the fact that the thought is a literary commonplace which Tacitus may have given utterance to in other places and at other times, is the important one, and the only consideration of any weight that has been advanced for denying to this parallelism the character of a literary allusion. We must say, therefore, that there is no reason why Pliny *may* not have had the Dialogus in mind in the words above quoted, but that they must be referred to it no one will now maintain, nor, on the other hand, should it be argued that they cannot refer to it. Clearly this is a place where certainty on either side is unattainable. As often Gudeman goes further than is wise in the interest of his argument, when he says that 'the identical collocation *nemora ac lucos*' is found in other Tacitean passages (Germania 9, 10 (not 11), 45). Suppose the author of the Dialogus had said that poets are fond of cheese and beer, and Pliny had repeated this statement, attributing it to Tacitus—should we believe any the less that he had reference to the words of the Dialogus because perhaps in the Germania cheese and beer were found in a familiar Teutonic collocation?

Evidently the *pièce de résistance* of this chapter of the Prolegomena is the endeavor to fix finally and within narrow limits the date of the Dialogue's publication. The discussion is opened by a consideration of the time when the conversation reported in the treatise was held, and, by an original and convincing interpretation of the words *centum et viginti anni ab interitu Ciceronis in hunc diem colliguntur* (ch. 17; more fully developed in the note ad loc.), the soundness of the text is vindicated and the date is shown to be fixed entirely by the words *sextam huius principatus stationem* (74/75). Starting, then, with the position laid down by Steiner, that the Dialogus, if Tacitean, must have been written before Domitian's reign, he refutes with much vigor, and successfully too, the objections derived from the phrase *iuvenis admodum* to assigning the publication to a period within six or seven years of the dramatic date. But his refutation, as he says, "only justifies the inference that the Dialogus *may* have been written in the reign of Titus. Happily, it can also be proved (1) that it *must* have been composed at that time and (2) that a later date, while quite incompatible with Tacitean authorship, is at the same time irreconcilable with the authorship of any one else" (p. xxx). The first of these points is the vital one, and yet, in spite of the very positive manner of its statement, I have been unable to discover that any evidence is produced which would restrict the date of publication to the years 79–81. His arguments are as follows: 1) The dramatic setting requires that not too great a time shall have elapsed between the conversation and publication. 2) The Dialogus, if written after Domitian, would involve a literary anachronism, since the subject with which it deals was no longer a theme of discussion in the time of Nerva and Trajan. This is a new point of view, developed with much ingenuity by the editor, and as a fact it is very noteworthy. But as a means of determining a date within the limits of a little more than a decade, it would seem to me of very doubtful value. For, as all the parallel instances adduced by Gudeman show, such literary discussions are never cut off with a square end, and there would be little difficulty in believing that straggling contributions were made for a considerable time to a subject which Quintilian had treated (in his *de causis corruptae eloquentiae*) toward the end of the eighties. But for both of these arguments it is only claimed that they show publication after Domitian's reign to be impossible. The reign of Domitian itself is treated in a peculiar manner. The editor has already given his approval to the sharp alternative formulated by Steiner, that Tacitus must have written the Dialogus before Domitian or he did not write it at all, and, so far as I have been able to ascertain, this is the only rejoinder made to the suggestion of assuming some date within the reign of Domitian. Of course, no one would think of assuming a date in the latter half or even two-thirds of that tyrant's reign, but really the first five years of it demanded some consideration in a discussion which aims to be exhaustive and to fix a definite limit on each side. I say that Steiner's alternative seems to be the only rejoinder to this suggestion, for what the editor has said on p. xxxii on this point he surely did not mean as a serious argument. "This hypothesis," he says, referring to the assumption of a date as late as 85, "is so clearly a mere subterfuge resorted to for the purpose of escaping the alleged difficulties found in the use of *iuvenis admodum* that we dismiss it without further comment, especially as Vibius

Crispus had by that time been doubtless restored to imperial favor, if not to his former power." Obviously, the reasons for rejecting this date are not given by calling the assumption of it a subterfuge, and the remaining force of the argument depends on the value we attach to the word 'doubtless.' So far, then, as the editor helps us we must fall back on Steiner's alternative. Gudeman does not, I believe, tell us why Steiner excludes so rigorously the reign of Domitian, but students familiar with their Tacitus will suspect, even if they do not know Steiner's treatise, that it is on the basis of the well-known words at the beginning of the Agricola, *per XV annos ... per silentium venimus.* And such, in fact, is the case: "also unter Domitian hat Tacitus den Dialog nicht herausgegeben und auch nicht geschrieben, wie er ja unter Domitian überhaupt nichts geschrieben hat" (p. 17). This was the only ground on which Steiner denied that the Dialogus could have been written between the years 81 and 96, and Gudeman has advanced no other. I think it will be with some surprise, therefore, that the reader learns in a note to the next chapter of the Prolegomena (p. xxxvi [43]) that the editor does not believe that the inference which Steiner and others have drawn from this passage of the Agricola is sound, and that "it does not necessarily exclude a rhetorical treatise like the Dialogus, any more than some of Tacitus' speeches which were certainly published in the reign of Domitian, as we must infer from Pliny's letters." Now let us see where we stand concerning the date of publication. The genetic development of the style of Tacitus, as well as the other arguments adduced by Gudeman, we will grant, make publication after Domitian impossible. We will also grant that it could not have been written in the darker days of Domitian's reign. But what have we left to show that it might not have been published in the first lustrum of his principate, accepting, as we must, the editor's interpretation of the passage from the proemium of the Agricola? I can find nothing, for we have voluntarily sacrificed the evidence which would restrict us to the years 79-81 by a juster interpretation of *per silentium.* Now, I do not wish to be misunderstood as an advocate of the later date (84-85) assumed by Wolf, Peterson and others. The point that I would make is, not that the early part of the reign of Domitian possesses any more probability than the reign of Titus (for I believe that the editor has dispelled all doubt which the words *iuvenis admodum* might cause), but that so sharply defined a limit as is here attempted cannot be fixed, and that we must content ourselves with saying that the Dialogus was written under Titus or in the earlier part of Domitian's reign.

Probably the most successful and striking portion of the editor's argument for the genuineness of the treatise is the section headed 'The Stylistic Character of the Dialogus.' Here, making thorough use of the studies of his predecessors and adding much new matter from his own observations, he shows in most admirable and thorough manner the points of identity between the style of the Dialogus and the later works, and how the elements of radical difference (the growth of which can still be seen in not a few instances) are all capable of an entirely reasonable and satisfactory explanation by the psychological change through which the author had passed and by the difference in subject-matter between this, his earliest work, and his later productions. After showing so clearly that there is no good reason for denying the author-

ship of Tacitus, it would seem almost useless to refute the claims of Quintilian and Pliny.   And yet, for completeness' sake, and because these ancient spectres have even of late years dared to stalk abroad, it will not perhaps seem a work of superfluous zeal to have finally laid them.   It is devoutly to be hoped that in these pages we have at length the concluding chapter of a controversy, the survival of which well into the nineteenth century is emphatically an anachronism.   We can pardon the suspicions of a Rhenanus and the doubts of a Lipsius, for they were but children of their generation and could not take an historical point of view.   In their time, and long after too, conjectures to Cicero might be supported by parallels from Plautus or St. Jerome, and Vigerus could teach the idioms of the Greek language by examples chosen indiscriminately from Demosthenes and St. Chrysostom.   But it is unpleasant and not to the credit of our studies to reflect that down to the present century quite universally, and for fifty years longer only to a less extent, the authenticity of a perfectly well-attested work of antiquity was denied on grounds that have most affinity with the oracular judgments of the higher criticism of antiquity—*hic versus Plauti non est, hic est.*

The second chapter of the Prolegomena deals with the dramatic structure of the Dialogus and the interlocutors.   It is opened with a brief summary of the contents of the work and then passes to a discussion of its real purpose.   This question, if it deserves the rank of such a designation and is not rather a hothouse product of German *Stubenhockerei,* arises from the fact that the discussion does not at once proceed to the question of the decline of oratory, but is preluded by a passage at arms on the relative merits of poetry and oratory.   The view of Gilbert, that the real purpose of the work is a defence of poetry, is dismissed very properly, not without much graphic amazement of exclamation points and question marks.   But the editor's own explanation of the relevancy of this introductory episode seems to me, in spite of its ingenuity and suggestiveness, to read more into the setting than is really there.   The interlocutors are then treated with admirable fullness and completeness.

Perhaps the most important point in this part of the Prolegomena is the endeavor to demonstrate that Secundus is the speaker of chs. 36–40, 8, and that hence a lacuna must be assumed before the words *non de otiosa, etc.*   The argument is pressed with great vigor, but not without some sophistries, nor does it seem to me convincing.   In the first place, it should be remembered that the burden of proof rests with those who assume the lacuna, and that the attitude of criticism must be sceptical until a conclusive demonstration is made.   That the MSS do not give any indication of lacuna here is not of course an insurmountable obstacle to its assumption, as is very well shown, though I think it will generally be felt that the MSS of the Dialogus have given us better ground than is commonly the case for trust in their faithful reproduction of the archetype, by the care with which they have noted the lacuna in ch. 34.   But next to MS evidence, which here is lacking, we may ask whether there is any immediate violation of the sequence of thought, the usual ground for the assumption of a lacuna not otherwise indicated.   The editor believes that there is, for he characterizes the transition as 'intolerably abrupt and sudden.'   Apparently, then, there is room here for a difference of opinion, since, for myself, I cannot really see how a closer connection in

thought could have been desired by the most rigorously logical critic than between the initial sentence of ch. 40 and the one beginning *non de otiosa etc.* (40, 8). The speaker has just referred to the enormous stimulus that was given to eloquence by the *contiones assiduae et datum ius potentissimum quemque vexandi, cum plurimi disertorum . . . ad incessendos principes viros . . . populi, ut histriones, auribus uterentur.* The speaker has already repeatedly remarked, incidentally to his description of the conditions that made ancient eloquence great, that such conditions were not desirable, though they produced great orators,[1] and what could be more natural than for the speaker, reminding his listeners of this thought, to characterize the excessive freedom of speech and of personal attack, which he has just described (in the words quoted) and which was always repugnant to Roman conceptions of personal and civic dignity, in the words that follow: *non de otiosa et quieta re loquimur et quae probitate et modestia gaudeat, set est magna illa . . . eloquentia alumna licentiae, . . . contumax, temeraria, adrogans, quae in bene constitutis civitatibus non oritur.* Indeed, nothing but a consideration of eloquence as a form of Greek παρρησία (*datum ius* (= ἄδεια) *vexandi*) could have suggested more naturally all of the opprobrious epithets that are attached to it here, and the passage therefore finds a fitting culmination in the admonition that not Sparta nor Crete (*quarum civitatum severissima disciplina et severissimae leges traduntur*), but Athens was the mother of the greatest orators, Athens where *non modo libertas* (sc. *dicendi*), *etiam libido impunita* (Ann. IV 35). I have considered this point somewhat in detail, because it seemed to me, from the standpoint of philological method, the most vital. If, therefore, my argument for the unity of the thought on both sides of the assumed lacuna has carried conviction, it will be seen that neither of the primary conditions for its assumption is present. But the editor lays apparently more stress on the fact that the thought of the words in ch. 40, 8 (*non de otiosa et quieta re*) is here repeated in almost the same words for the third time. But leaving aside the fact that the consideration is a purely subjective one and something which might have appealed differently to an ancient reader and a modern critic, it should be observed, as the editor himself points out, that we have the assurance of the speaker that the idea is one which requires repetition (*ut subinde admoneo* 37, 29). If repetition is ever tolerable and ever occurs without arousing a suspicion of text-corruption, it would seem to furnish least occasion for so doing where it is expressly apologized for and justified by the speaker. Indeed, this thought is most essential to the argument of Maternus, for it required the clearest presentation of the fact that great eloquence *is* an inevitable concomitant of disorder to lead up to his last contention that it is not worth the price. It is to the clear enunciation of this last idea that the sentence in question affords a transition, although it is foreshadowed and intimated from the beginning. Concerning the last and most important argument made by the editor for assigning only the portion from 40, 8 on to Maternus, viz. that it contains sentiments at variance with those expressed in 36–40, 7, I have already implied my criticism. But let us first note briefly the character of these so-called contradictions. The important ones will be found of this

[1] Quis ignorat utilius ac melius esse frui pace quam bello vexari? plures tamen bonos proeliatores bella quam pax ferunt, similis eloquentiae condicio (37, 31).

nature: *cum parum esset in senatu breviter censere* (36, 26) and *quid enim opus est longis in senatu sententiis* (41, 14). Now, as I have intimated above, the speaker passes in the sentence before which the lacuna is assumed from a consideration of the *fact* that eloquence is a concomitant of disorder to a *judgment* on that fact (viz. that the price of such eloquence is too great). The same relation holds between the two passages here quoted. The first describes the fact, the second accepts it and admits its influence on oratory, but passes condemnatory judgment upon it. But while practically all the utterances from 40, 9 on are judgments of facts already presented, the part before 40, 8, in which the facts or conditions which produced ancient eloquence are set forth, contains also *judgments* of the same general character as those given more directly and emphatically when the speaker has passed over to criticism. One such example may suffice (omitted by Gudeman from his parallel columns of 'contradictions and repetitions'): *cum tantum orator saperet, quantum erranti populo persuadere poterat* (36, 8). With this compare ch. 40, 20, in which, after observing that Athens, where *omnia populus ... poterat*, had produced great orators, the speaker continues: *nostra quoque civitas donec erravit etc.* The judgment is uttered incidentally where the aim was to present the actual conditions, and is repeated directly where the speaker has passed from facts to criticism. The number of incidental judgments thus pronounced by the speaker of chs. 36–40, 8 is so large that it is hard to see on what ground Gudeman bases his assertion that the speaker (i. e. of 36–40, 8) "leaves us to infer that he would rejoice in a superior oratorical development at any cost." Finally Gudeman urges that Maternus, having resolved to quit the forum, cannot well have maintained the *indispensability* of eloquence, and cites in evidence of this statement ch. 36, 23: *quin immo sibi ipsi persuaserant* (sc. *antiqui*) *neminem sine eloquentia ... adsequi posse ... eminentem locum*, but for what purpose others, I fancy, will wonder, as I do. That Secundus had no share in the debate I do not of course argue. That is a point which only additional and older MS material or ancient allusion, hitherto unobserved, can determine.

Chapter III of the Prolegomena discusses the literary sources of the Dialogus and opens with a proof that the dialogue, "barring a certain historical background, must be regarded as a work of the creative imagination," basing the necessity of such a proof on the statement that the majority of editors and critics have tacitly assumed that the author's explanation of the origin of the treatise, as a faithful reproduction from memory of an actual conversation, is given in good faith. While accepting gratefully the demonstration which follows of the essentially fictitious character of the dialogue, and which illustrates the point with more fullness and detail than I have seen done elsewhere, I cannot but feel that the editor does injustice to the discernment of his predecessors in affirming so strongly that they have failed to recognize the real nature of the dramatic setting. But this is a trifling matter compared with the discussion of the sources of the Dialogus which follows, and which must be reckoned among the most brilliant parts of the book. Here, after calling attention to some of the more striking resemblances to Ciceronian passages which have been noted by others also, the editor presents us with some entirely new and very striking evidence of the author's use of

the Hortensius. This proof is a most ingenious specimen of philological combination, and affords testimony enough to the wideness and thoroughness of the author's reading. The consideration of the Acta of Mucianus, which are mentioned only in the Dialogus, as a possible source is new and interesting, but of course purely conjectural for any part except 37, 8, where reference is made to them. With more confidence Gudeman says of the Epistulae of the same author (ib.) that he "feels convinced that what we learn of the epistolary war waged between the adherents of the Attic school and Cicero, is directly based upon this identical compilation." As a surmise or conjecture, affording a definite starting-point from which investigation might proceed, that is very good, but to be convinced (though I fancy I am taking the author's words too seriously) on the basis of the possibility here advanced would reflect, I fear, on the character of philological proof. Very different from this is the admirable and brilliant demonstration which follows, that many of the ideas on education expressed by Quintilian and Tacitus (in the Dialogus) are ultimately traceable to the famous work of Chrysippus, περὶ παίδων ἀγωγῆς.

The fourth chapter of the Prolegomena deals with the 'Style and Language' of the Dialogus. The matter is presented in a very convenient tabular form, with well-nigh exhaustive fullness of illustration. Its value is greatly heightened by references to the more detailed discussion of certain usages in the notes. I believe it may fairly claim to be the first adequate treatment of the subject that has been presented, and it is hard to see how it will ever be superseded.

The fifth and concluding chapter is devoted to the MSS, and contains, besides a description of each of the important codices, a full discussion of the questions of interrelationship and classification, chiefly following Scheuer. With the latter's conclusion concerning the superiority of the Y class Gudeman agrees, and by the correction of some of Scheuer's errors he is able to give to this result a more conclusive character. In this connection may be mentioned the interesting confirmation of the correctness of this view, derived from a consideration of Tacitean usage, in two passages (22, 4 and 22, 8) where the X and Y classes are at variance concerning the position of *eiusdem* and *iam*.

The text is beautifully printed in widely leaded lines and is accompanied by very convenient marginal summaries. The editor has adopted the rule that every deviation from MS authority shall be indicated by italics, but the method chosen has not been carried out consistently, so that one is often at a loss to know, without consulting the *apparatus criticus*, the extent and nature of the change. When one reads *ex*cepi (accepi MSS) or orat*io*nis (oratoris MSS) it is of course clear that a slight variation from the MS tradition is indicated; but why should this simple and convenient device have been abandoned in such cases as *famam* (40 ext., formam MSS), where *f*amam would have made it clear, without reference to the ap. crit., that the word was neither an addition of the editor nor an emendation for a word of totally different graphic value? The same thing is true in a good many other instances, e. g. 33, 24 *paratiorem* (parate MSS) instead of parat*iorem* (but 8, 10 correctly min*ores*, minus MSS). In 41, 9 enim is carelessly printed, instead of *enim*, as if a reading based on MS evidence. It is to be regretted that the editor chose no

means of making clear at a glance the difference between words which are due to the emendation of MS readings and editorial additions or supplements. Why should not the customary pointed brackets <> have been employed? Probably no feature of the book will render it so indispensable an aid to students as the very full and clear apparatus criticus, in which, in addition to the variants of the MSS and the record of conjectural readings adopted, the editor has given, with almost unnecessary fullness, the principal conjectures to the text, especially of recent scholars. I have observed but few omissions of any consequence. In 30, 7 *statim dicturus* is given as Gronov's conjecture, instead of *dicturus* simply, as if *statim* were not afforded by the MSS.

The constitution of the text itself challenges especial attention from the fact that the edition is dedicated to Vahlen, perhaps the leading living Latinist in the realm of pure textual criticism, by a pupil of that distinguished master of the *ars critica*. The independence and originality of the editor in this regard are in striking contrast to the reserve and self-distrust which has hitherto characterized the work of our foremost American scholars in this field. The editor has been trained in the best school of textual criticism, and his book is full of excellent precepts on method and sharp rebuffs of the *libido coniciendi* which has harassed the innocent Dialogus to an uncommon degree. But, alas for good intentions, I can but fear that it will be the general verdict of criticism that he himself must be included in the goodly company of sinners against sound texts. Gudeman has contributed above thirty conjectures (emendations from his point of view[1]) to the text of the Dialogus, a considerable number of which had already been made public and discussed in this Journal. Of this number the following seem to me to deserve the title of emendations: 5, 28 *sive . . . vel . . . sive*; 6, ext. *quae diu . . . grata, gratiora* (an improvement on Nissen's similar suggestion, in which the observation that *alia* is a dittography of *diu* deserves special notice); 11, 16 *tuetur* (*tueor* MSS); 13, ext. (involving only the bracketing of *enim* and *-que*, and based on a correct interpretation of *quandoque*); 32, 15 *ius <suae> civitatis* (supported by Cic. de or. I 40, 184—which is, by the way, cited in a misleading manner); 38, 5 *modum <in> dicendo* (based on the fact that Andresen's re-collation of A does away with the variant *dicendi*). Not quite so certain, but attractive and probable, is the reading adopted in 7, 13 *apud iuvenes vacuos et adulescentes*. One or two suggestions are rather colorless, obviating some difficulties, but not carrying conviction of their correctness. E. g. 8, 3 *non min<ores>* (anticipated by Haase).

Over against this credit side, however, is to be placed a much longer list of changes, in good part more important than those just mentioned, where it is my own conviction that the editor has inflicted positive corruptions on the text of Tacitus, or by the assumption of interpolation has deprived him of his due. It would be obviously out of the question for me to review the score

---

[1] Is it customary or right to make no distinction between the words *emendation* and *conjecture*? I do not of course refer to the fact that G. designates his own conjectures as emendations (that is his duty if he has convinced himself that he has restored the author's words), but to such expressions as these, where the MS reading is defended: p. 133 (10, 18), "it is needless to discuss the *emendation* of Ribbeck"; p. 266 (26, 10), "*debeat* is the reading of our MSS, which we have no right to *emend*, unless," etc.; p. 276 (28, 5), "the many *emendations* of the MS reading," etc.; and elsewhere frequently.

and more of conjectures that belong to this category. Some of the most important, however, I shall select for comment.

7, 10 *tum habere quod si non in* ALVO *oritur, nec codicillis datur nec cum gratia venit.*] *in alio* MSS. G. enumerates thirteen conjectures here and is himself the author of the reading in the text, which Pithoeus also had arrived at before him. All editors seem to agree that the MS reading is untenable, and they have conspired to prevent Tacitus from saying what he meant. A defence of the MS reading will be a sufficient refutation of this conjecture as well as others. A writer on Christian apologetics says: "If a defence of our belief rest not on other foundation (i. e. *nisi in alio oritur*) it cannot gain support from miracles and wonders," and we understand him well enough, nor do we require to be told that he refers to the deeper spiritual things of the faith. And so here, when Tacitus says, "Then I seemed to possess that which if it take not its rise in another source (*nisi in alio oritur*), is not given by letters patent nor comes with favor," why should we not understand just as clearly ₜhat reference is made to natural endowment or talent? The Latinity of *in alio* is quite unexceptionable, nor does the usage *in alio = in* (or *ex*) *alia re* call for any comment or defence in Tacitus. This same indefiniteness of statement where no obscurity arises we find in 8, 24 in the same connection: *Vespasianus ... intellegit ... Marcellum et Crispum attulisse ad amicitiam suam quod non a principe acceperint nec accipi possit.*

10, 20 *<mox> summa adeptus*] *summa adeptus* MSS. Gudeman rejects Vahlen's defence of the MS tradition because *adeptus* never has the meaning of *praeditus aliqua re* in Tacitus. This is certainly no good reason for deserting a reading in harmony with Ciceronian usage, when *all other* examples of *adipisci* are from the later works. In our author, whose style confessedly suffered a radical transformation, we should least of all attempt to restore consistency of usage between works separated by a dozen years and more. This is a complaint one has to make repeatedly.

18, 6 *antiquos ... quos utinam nulla parte* MIRATUS *esset Calvus aut Caelius aut ... Cicero*] *imitatus* MSS., which seems to G. absurd and impossible. The conjecture is defended at length in this Journal, vol. XII, pp. 339–42. That *imitatus* is tolerable for Caelius G. admits (cf. 21, 17). That Aper could have easily applied it to Cicero is shown by 22, 10: *priores eius orationes non carent vitiis antiquitatis.* But "when we come to Calvus the *imitatus* of our text is simply ludicrous" (A. J. P., l. c.), says G., and cites Cicero's judgment of the over-refined style of Calvus. But we have to do here not with Cicero, but with Aper, who, as G. reminds us (ad 21, 33), "does not shrink from exaggeration and misrepresentation, if it suits his purpose." That he did not share Cicero's, and indeed the prevalent, estimate of Calvus we may learn from 21, 13 *quo minus sublimius et cultius diceret ... ingenium et vires defuisse. Imitatus* is therefore entirely appropriate in the mouth of Aper, however it might be in fact. On the other hand, *miratus* would be distinctly out of place here, for it is not clear why Aper should wish so ardently that they had not *admired* the ancients if, as G. maintains, he could not affirm that this admiration had had any effect on their style.

20, 7 (*iudex*), *nisi ... nitore et cultu descriptionum* VITIATUS *et corruptus est, aversatur*] *invitatus* MSS. This conjecture seems to me so obviously to 'vitiate

and corrupt' the text of Tacitus that I should not discuss it, had it not been adopted by Bennett. The general considerations advanced against *invitatus* are trivial, and seem to depend on an exaggerated interpretation of the turpitude implied in *corruptus.* To say that a judge is *bribed* is doubtless very bad, but when you have already said *nitore et cultu descriptionum,* you have taken away the suggestion of baseness beforehand. And what allurement could be more harmless than charm of eloquence by which the judge is made to listen to a long speech, against his will and intention? The second difficulty concerning the use of *invitare* only of 'harmless allurements' does not therefore exist.[1] Concerning the stylistic principle which G. claims is here violated for the only time in the Dialogus by the use of *et* to connect two verbs standing in some causal relation to each other (instead of *ac*); cf. 9, 7 *defensus et tibi obligatus*; 17, 20 *arcere litoribus et pellere aggressi sunt* ('attempted to keep from landing and (that failing) to drive out'); and perhaps also 39, 23 *excitare et incendere.* Finally, what possible significance can there be in the fact that Cicero, in an entirely different connection (viz. election bribery), has used these two words in juxtaposition? We have had occasion already to complain of the abuse of this form of argument, which only has significance, as a rule, in defence of uncertain Latinity.

36, 2 *eloquentia, sicut flamma,* . . . *motibus excitatur et urendo* CALESCIT] (anticipated by Maehly) *clarescit* MSS. The climax of the simile is rudely destroyed, G. believes, by the reading *clarescit,* which is an 'otiose repetition' of *motibus excitatur.* Accepting the editor's standpoint, let us observe the use of *excitare.* The word is almost a terminus technicus of an early stage in the production of fire, and hence is naturally antecedent to *urendo clarescit.* This usage G. admits in his critical note ad loc. ("the brightness of the fire is the immediate effect of *motibus excitatur*"), but he still holds to his view (A. J. P. XII, p. 346) that *clarescit* is an otiose repetition and hence false. But is it not a rather loose use of language to characterize the statement of an effect from a cause as a repetition? Or again, why is light (*clarescit*) as an effect of *motibus excitatur* more of a repetition than heat (*calescit*)? But defending the MS reading positively, we may observe that the author does not lose sight of the figure in *clarescit* in the rest of his speech, e. g. 37, 21 *crescit cum amplitudine rerum vis ingenii, nec quisquam c l a r a m et i l l u s t r e m orationem efficere potest nisi qui causam parem invenit.*

Finally, one or two instances where the suggestion of text-corruption has come from a 'transposition variant.'

6, 8 *plerumque venire*] following Codex D. This order is accepted against all the other MSS because "*plerumque* in a non-superlative sense is with two exceptions out of 22 exx. always prepositive." If we inquire into the nature of D we learn from Gudeman, in the article to which he refers us ad loc., that "this codex abounds in transpositions so that it is difficult to determine whether they were brought about by accident or not." I fancy that most of us will think that this sort of business is to saw off the limb on which we are sitting, and will prefer to make the ratio of *plerumque*'s position 19 : 3 instead of 20 : 2.

---

[1] Though nothing to the point, G.'s observation that *invitare* is used exclusively of such harmless allurements is unreasonable and incorrect, as Ovid, Her. 16 (17), 183 shows, *invitant omnia culpam* (cited by Lewis and Short).

19, 4 *Cassium Severum* . . . *quem primum adfirmant flexisse ab ista vetere* [*atque directa*] *dicendi via*]. But does *directa* admit of no satisfactory explanation? Interpretation must start from a consideration of the character of Severus' oratory, of which Tacitus says in 26, 18 *primus contempto ordine rerum, omissa modestia et pudore verborum etc.* Cf. also Seneca, Epp. 100, 5 (on Fabianus) *nihil invenies sordidum : electa verba sunt, non captata nec h u i u s s a e c u l i m o r e contra naturam suam posita et inversa.* Most of Gudeman's criticism of *directa* is beside the mark, for Aper's complaint has to do chiefly with the length and tediousness of the older orations and their simplicity (*directa via*), amounting to dullness.

34, 21 *auditorium semper plenum* [*semper novum*]. *Novum* is bracketed as being an epithet equally applicable to the audiences of the speaker's own day, and not peculiar to those of the republic. But wholly without ground, for (1) the origin of the gloss is not apparent (nor does Gudeman suggest an explanation of it), nor (2) is the word superfluous. It would scarcely seem necessary to call attention to the fact that the distinction here made is between the audience of a school-room (*in condiscipulis nihil profectus cum pueri inter pueros et adulescentuli inter adulescentulos pari securitate et dicant et audiantur* 35, 9) and that of the *iudicia et contiones* (34, 5), before which the young orator of the republic got his training. To call the latter *new* in distinction from the former is to emphasize a significant difference.

Finally, in the acceptance of conjectures of other scholars, the editor seems to me to have been too free, and I have noted more than a dozen instances where their conjectures have displaced perfectly satisfactory MS readings. Some of the more important instances are 14, 12 *ardentior* (*audentior* MSS; cf. Lexicon Quintilianum, s. voc.); 25, 18 *Asinius nervosior* (*numerosior* MSS; cf. Quint. 9, 4, 76, and Schmalz, D. Sprachgebrauch des Asin. Pol., p. 5 ff.); 28, 16 *aut eligebatur* (*eligebatur autem* MSS, which is required by context, as ch. 29 init. shows; i. e. mother *and* relative on the one hand, compared with the hired nurse *and* worthless slave on the other).

The largest portion of the book is taken up by the critical and exegetical commentary, the critical portion of which has already been discussed. It would, however, be very unjust to leave the reader to draw an inference concerning the exegetical part (which is much the larger) from the judgment which has been pronounced on the critical notes. Indeed, there is no relation between them in point of merit, and whatever others may think of the constitution of the text and its justification, I venture to affirm that there will be little divergence of opinion concerning the value of the exegetical commentary. Perhaps its most characteristic feature is the fact that it carries out consistently and methodically the principle of interpreting Tacitus from himself in regard to thought as well as language. In the latter respect greatest completeness has been attained—a completeness which, of course, would hardly have been possible without the Lexicon Taciteum. But, as in relation to the later works of Tacitus, so in relation to the whole history of the Latin language, the material for comparison of usage in regard to vocabulary, semasiology, syntax and style has been amassed with a fullness which excites admiration and amazement. It is from this point of view that the

work will doubtless appeal most strongly to present tendencies in American scholarship and receive from it a warm welcome. But while this is perhaps the most conspicuous phase of the commentary, I have not observed that any side of a just interpretation has been neglected. That the most important illustrative passages have been printed in full, all users of the book will be grateful, and they will admire, too, the diligence and judgment with which new material has been summoned. It would require a much longer familiarity with the commentary than I now possess, in spite of diligent and interested study, to point out exactly the number of new interpretations of the text itself, of observations of linguistic usage, or of original contributions to the most varied phases of classical study that are contained in these pages, but it must be very considerable. But I have already far transcended the limits of space allotted me, and I must forbear to touch on the countless points which here invite attention. One matter, however, of more general interest I may perhaps be pardoned for alluding to. On p. 58 Gudeman says that the dread of repeating the same word "is a modern stylistic sentimentality, quite foreign to the ancients." This view I have heard expressed repeatedly, and perhaps it is true, but I venture at least to challenge it. The editor, in support of his view, refers to Quintilian, X 1, 7 (not 17, of course), but Quintilian in this passage (discussing the means of acquiring *copia rerum et verborum*) does not by any means imply that it is unnecessary to avoid such repetition, but condemns as puerile and useless the mechanical method of attaining that end by committing synonyms to memory. *Nobis autem*, he continues, *copia cum iudicio paranda est.* The authorities, furthermore, to whom Gudeman refers, so far as accessible to me, do not share his view. To these we may add Volkmann (p. 577), who observes that such repetition is avoided except where a special rhetorical figure is designed (to which class several of Gudeman's examples belong), and Schmalz (Stilistik, p. 579), who notes that the repetition without special motive is an evidence of carelessness, and that, on the other hand, Silver Latinity in particular performed almost incredible feats of variation in the expression of the same thought. My own observation is based on no collections of material nor detailed examination of the point in question, but it had led me to the belief that the avoidance of repetition of the same word is an element of ancient style certainly as early as Plato, and in Latin from Cicero, inclusive, on.[1] That examples to the contrary might be cited in considerable number I do not doubt, but whether they would prove any more than a similar collection (which could easily be made) from English writers seems to me questionable. That repetitions in the interest of clearness (or from carelessness) occur in almost all writers is obvious, and this fact, but with a perfectly clear implication of habitual avoidance, Quintilian recognizes when he says (IX 1, 24): *neque verebor explicandae rei gratia frequentiorem eiusdem nominis repetitionem.*

---

[1] The ποικιλία, which is so striking a characteristic of all our literature and which is nowhere more boldly championed than by Dr. Miles Smith in the Preface to the Authorized Version, seems to be distinctly due to Cicero, and Cicero, in his turn, was much under the fascination of Plato, who, to be frank, abuses ποικιλία so much as to make it impossible at times to take him as seriously as a philosopher ought to be taken. Isokrates, whose pretensions to 'philosophy' Plato heartily despises, is very exact in the use of words, and Quintilian (10, 1, 13) is careful to warn the beginner against change for the sake of change.—B. L. G.

The work is concluded by a very valuable and complete bibliography, a complete *index locorum* and an *index rerum et verborum*, not quite so complete as the fullness of the commentary would seem to demand.

Where so much is given it would seem ungrateful to complain of the omission of anything, and probably what I have in mind does not properly fall within the sphere of an edition. But where such fullness has been aimed at and attained, it might not seem unfair to have expected in the Prolegomena some discussion of the Dialogus as a literary work and of its place in the history of Roman literature. For while the student who has read widely will doubtless know it, to the more casual reader it would have been a service to point out the unique position of the Dialogus as a work of literary criticism : to have called attention to the fact that, in spite of imitation of Ciceronian phraseology and dramatic motives, it is an original work of first magnitude— indeed, the most original specimen of literary criticism that Latin antiquity has handed down to us. For where else in ancient literary judgments shall we find what we call the historical point of view—the realization that literature is a part of life and dependent upon social and political conditions and changes? This thought has become so commonplace with us that we are in danger of failing to distinguish between the clearness of historical vision which characterizes the criticisms of Tacitus (especially from ch. 36 on— Maternus) and the technical standpoint of Quintilian. Quintilian, we can imagine, would have guaranteed to restore the eloquence of the republic, if he could but reform the false teaching of his day, but Tacitus knew better than that. Not that Tacitus was uninfluenced by Quintilian, for somehow, whether directly or indirectly, he was familiar with his teachings, but he transfused the data derived from them with historical insight. Hence the seemingly anomalous circumstance (and so also in relation to Cicero) of producing a work which betrays dependence in detail, but a much larger independence. But it is ungracious to complain of omissions where so much is given, and for this and every other question pertaining to the Dialogus, Professor Gudeman's edition furnishes abundant material. It is unfortunate that the nature of things requires us to be briefer in praise than in dissent, but it will, I may trust, be understood that my appreciation of the whole work is not less grateful and hearty because in many places I am unable to share the editor's views. The work is an enduring monument to the scholarship and devotion of the editor, and deserves to be widely circulated.

Jan. 15, 1895.   GEORGE L. HENDRICKSON.

———

The Stanford Dictionary of Anglicised Words and Phrases, edited for the Syndics of the University Press by C. A. M. FENNELL, D. Litt. Cambridge, At the University Press, 1892.

This valuable dictionary should have been noticed sooner, but *vita brevis, longa ars*, and no one has yet discovered the art of compressing into a short life all that one wishes to do. The late Mr. J. F. Stanford left to the University of Cambridge, in 1882, £5000 for the production of a dictionary of " Anglicised Words and Phrases," for which Mr. Stanford had made many notes and collections. He had himself interpreted the term ' Anglicised ' to

mean (*a*) words "borrowed and wholly or partly naturalised"; (*b*) "used in English literature without naturalisation"; (*c*) "familiarised by frequent quotation," as in the phrase above given, which is traced to Seneca, De Brevit. Vit. 1, with slight transposition.   When the University accepted this bequest, the Syndics of the Press appointed a committee, on which were Profs. Mayor, Skeat and Bensly, Mr. Aldis Wright, and Dr. Postgate, to draw up a scheme for their guidance, which is as follows, examples excluded:

"1. All words and phrases of non-European origin found in English literature, if borrowed *directly* (with or without change of sound or form) from non-European languages.

"2. All Latin and Greek words which retain their original form, and all Latin and Greek phrases, in use in English literature.

"3. All words and phrases borrowed directly from modern European languages excepting French.

"4. All words and phrases borrowed from the French which retain the French pronunciation.

"5. All words borrowed from French, Latin, and Greek, since the introduction of printing, whether now altered or but imperfectly naturalised and now obsolete.

" The work shall not professedly include dialectic forms."

Where we have such a comprehensive scheme, for which we should be truly thankful, it seems ungracious to ask for more, but if the time-limit in No. 5 could have been put at the Norman Conquest, which would practically have carried the labor back not more than two hundred years (for the first half of the period was not prolific in such words), we should have had a complete dictionary of the Romance side of the language in brief.   However, we are grateful for what we have, and are not disposed to complain.   As it is, the dictionary and supplement (it is unfortunate in dictionaries that there should be need for supplements, but it cannot be helped, I suppose) contain 12,798 articles, which treat of 13,018 words and phrases, and 2708 cross-references. The 12,798 articles are concerned with 10,927 words, 1873 phrases and 278 quotations, proverbs or maxims.   13,000 words and phrases seem a small number for such a scheme, but derivatives are excluded, which saves labor and space, and reduces greatly the number of words.

A criticism to which I think the dictionary is justly liable is the lack of any key to the pronunciation.   The nearest approach to such a key is the system of accentuation adopted, which the editor describes as follows: " The accentuation of naturalised words has been approximately indicated by using – to represent an unaccented syllable, ' to represent an accented syllable, " to represent a comparatively strongly accented syllable.   If the mark ' or " be repeated with regard to the pronunciation of one word, it is not implied that the two stresses are quite equal, nor is it implied that all syllables marked as unaccented have precisely the same stresslessness."   Now, it seems to me that even in such a system it would have been better to use the breve (ᵛ) instead of the macron (–) to mark an unaccented syllable, or to leave it unmarked; but if the system of pronunciation of the New English Dictionary had been adopted, it would have added to the usefulness of the work.

As to the general execution of the work, it seems to me (I speak with becoming humility) to be as well done as could have been expected.   Some

omissions have been noticed, and examples have not been brought chrono-
logically as far as might sometimes be desired, but much labor has been spent
on the work, and the result, on the whole, is very satisfactory.

Acknowledgments are made to the New English Dictionary, our standard
as far as published, "up to *Cass*," to Prof. Skeat's, Cassell's and the Century
Dictionaries. The last might have been consulted with advantage in respect
to more words, for some have been omitted which are there included, as, for
example, *picayune* and *lagn(i)appe*, the former used all over this country, and
the latter among the Creoles of the South. *Per contra*, the Century omits the
interjection *Caramba!*, also common among the Spanish Creoles, which the
Stanford gives.

The etymology has been limited "to the indication of the language from
which a word or phrase has been borrowed and of its native form and meaning,
unless there was some fresh light to be thrown upon a derivation." Our
attention is, however, called to some etymologies, and we are told that the
assignment of a word to its native tongue supported by the illustrative quota-
tions often corrects current derivations. "So far, so good"; but while this
might answer for some, it would not do for others who wish more exact
information, and we should have liked to see greater attention paid to
etymology, as in the N. E. D. As our attention has been called to *Abraca-
dabra* as one of the words on which 'fresh light' has been thrown, we may
compare the articles in the N. E. D. and the Stanford. The former gives
"[L.; origin unknown. Occurs first in a poem by Q. Severus [read Serenus]
Sammonicus, 2d c.]." After the definitions, examples are quoted, of date
1696, 1810, 1824, 1860, 1879. The latter gives the definition and the usual
triangular arrangement of the letters, quotations from 1565, 1584, 1657, 1684,
1711, 1840, 1883, and the following etymological note: "[For first known
mention, see quot. fr. Mather [i. e. 1684], in which Sammonicus is mentioned
as using *Abrocadara*, but S. is mentioned earlier in the quotation from Calfhill,
1565. Severus in N. E. D. should be Serenus. According to C. W. King,
Talism. and Amul., in Early Christ. Numism., p. 200, corrupted from Heb.
ha-b'rākāh dabbĕrāh, = 'pronounce the blessing' (i. e. the sacred name).]"
We see here an improvement upon the N. E. D., and a reasonable etymology
given for the first time in any dictionary, as far as I know. The Century has
merely "[L.; occurring first in a poem (*Praecepta de Medicina*) by Q. Serenus
Sammonicus, in the second century: mere jargon. Cf. *abracalam.*]." Neither
Webster, Worcester, nor Stormonth ventures on any etymology, but the last
adds to the definitions "an oriental deity" (!). Skeat omits the word, as he
does so many others that one searches his dictionary for in vain. The latest,
so-called 'Standard' has: "The word is said to be from *A*b, *B*en, *R*uach,
*A*cadosch, Hebrew for Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." This recalls the ante-
diluvian period in etymology, when it was sufficient to guess at part of a word,
and understand (i. e. *supply*, not *comprehend*) the rest. It is evidently taken
from the example in the N. E. D. under "1860, T. A. G. Balfour," q. v., but
Dr. Murray did not endorse that fanciful etymology. If we go to the German
and French dictionaries, we receive no further light. Grimm (*erste Lieferung*,
1852) gives no etymology, and defines simply as "*unverständliche beschwörungs-
formel*," with two examples from Goethe. The dictionary of the French

Academy (6th ed., 1835) and Poitevin (1860) give no etymology, but the latter adds an example from Victor Hugo. Littré (1885) gives the same example from Victor Hugo, and says: "Proprement *abrasadabra*, car en grec il s'écrit ΑΒΡΑΣΑΔΑΒΡΑ. On fait venir ce mot de l'hébreu *ab*, père, *ruah*, esprit, et *dabar*, parole. D'après cette etymologie, il designerait la Trinité. Grotefend (*Ersch und Gruber's Encyclopaedie*) le regarde comme composé du mot persan *abrasas*, dénomination mystique de la divinité, et de l'hébreu *dabar*, parole, parole divine."

But here we have a mixture of Aryan and Semitic, unless *abrasas* is an Arabic word incorporated into Persian, *s* softened from *k* (?). Cannot some Semitic scholar untie the knot, and justify Mr. King's etymology? We fail to see why a Hebrew should invoke the Trinity, as in Littré's explanation and Balfour's example, but with King's explanation it becomes clear. We do not find in either the N. E. D. or the Stanford the suitable example from Defoe's 'History of the Plague' (quoted in my 'Selections in English Prose,' p. 377), although the Stanford gives a contemporary one from the 'Spectator.' *Abracalam*, of similar import, is omitted in both of these dictionaries, though given in the Century and defined as "A cabalistic word used as a charm among the Jews," but without etymology. It is found in the Supplement to the Dictionary of the Academy (1856) as "*Abracalan*. Terme mystérieux auquel les juifs attribuent la même vertu qu'à *Abracadabra*. Selon Selden ce mot renferme les noms d'une déesse syrienne." Here I think we have traced to its source the idea of the "oriental divinity," which also appears in Adler's German dictionary, s. v. *Abracadabra*, as "name of a Syrian divinity." Is it as mistaken in the one case as in the other, and is Selden responsible, after all?

But the trail has carried me too far, and I must cut short this notice. I had wanted to note, with examples, "haro, sb.: Fr.: hue and cry. 1803 Macdonnel, *Dict. Quot.*" This is all that Dr. Fennell gives, but this word is the same as Middle English *harrow(e)!*, very common in The Mysteries, and so it should be excluded under No. 5, as it was in use before "the introduction of printing." Stratmann gives the form *haro*, "O. Fr. *haro, harou*," with examples from the Ayenbite of Inwyt, The Towneley Mysteries, Chaucer and Langland. If *haro* is rightly included, *orange* should have found a place, as it is traced back to Persian *nāranj* (see Century Dictionary), Spanish *naranja* retaining the *n*, but O. F. *orenge* having lost it. This is the earliest form in English too, the first example given by Stratmann being from 'Cleanness': "As *orenge* & oþer fryt & apple garnade" (Morris's E. E. Alliterative Poems, *c.* 1360, II 1044). It occurs as *oronge* in the Promptorium Parvulorum, *c.* 1440. Having come from Persian through Old French, it would, however, be excluded under No. 5. In some cases the earliest examples of the uses of words are taken from the N. E. D., but in others we find earlier examples in the Stanford, so that this work cannot be neglected even by Dr. Murray. However, it seems that no dictionary can keep pace with the language, for while the collection of phrases in the Stanford is excellent—indeed, one of the strong points of the work— we do not find the upstart *fin de siècle*.

A useful addition to the dictionary would be a list of the full titles of the works read, from which examples have been taken, with author and date, for while these can generally be identified in the abbreviations, this is not always the case, and it would be convenient to have a reference-list of them all together.

Now, when so much more attention is paid to lexicography than ever before, this work will prove a serviceable addition to the resources of the language in that department, for it is no mere compilation, but a large number of works have been read specially for this dictionary, and most of the examples are cited at first hand. It is no disadvantage that dialectic forms are excluded, for we are soon to have an 'English Dialect Dictionary,' edited by Prof. Joseph Wright, of Oxford, which will cover the whole ground.

<div align="right">JAMES M. GARNETT.</div>

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by Dr. J. A. H. MURRAY. Everybody–Ezod (Forming part of vol. III). By HENRY BRADLEY. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1894.

The publication of this small part of the New English Dictionary completes the letter E, which has been wholly edited by Mr. Bradley, while Dr. Murray is responsible for D, which "is now passing through the press," and these two letters will form vol. III. A very recent circular informs us that "the Delegates of the Clarendon Press have been urged from many quarters to consider the more frequent publication of the subsequent portions of the work in smaller instalments, as each is completed by the editors," and they "have arranged for the punctual issue of the letters D and F in *Quarterly Sections.*" The circular states that the first sections of each of those letters will be issued on Nov. 15—they have just (Jan. 1) come to hand—and that "from and after Jan. 1, 1895, one section at least of each letter, consisting of 64 pages, will be published quarterly." F and G will be edited by Mr. Bradley, H, by Dr. Murray. It is gratifying to know that the publication will proceed hereafter more rapidly and regularly, as this has been the chief drawback to the great undertaking. Those of us who are now in middle life would like to see its completion, and under the hands of the present most competent editors. I should, however, prefer one thick part annually to four thin parts quarterly. It is ten years since the first part was issued, and four letters have just been completed, but at an average of two letters per year, one from each editor, the next ten years may see the completion. It is now more than forty years since the first part of Grimm's great dictionary was published, and it is not yet completed. Moreover, this is a much fuller work than Grimm's dictionary.

There is no preface to this small part, so that we cannot give any statistics, which some may not regret. Although Mr. Bradley says under *Everybody*, "Sometimes incorrectly with *pl. vb.* or *pron.*," the usage certainly has "the rime of age." The very first example, from Lord Berners (*c.* 1530), is "Everye bodye was in *theyr* lodgynges"; so Sidney (1580), "that everie body might come and take *their* meat freely"; *Horae Subsecivae* (1620), "To take upon him the disciplining of every body for *their* errours"; De Foe (1725), "*Do* not everybody else love him?"; Bp. Warburton (1759), "Every body else I meet with *are* full ready to go of *themselves*"; Byron (1820), "Everybody does and says what *they* please"; Ruskin (1866), "Everybody seems to recover *their* spirits." There are five other examples, in four of which no verb or pronoun occurs with *everybody*, and the fifth is from Bp. Berkeley (1720), "Time, place, and motion . . . are what every body knows"; but Byron and Ruskin too use

the singular verb with the plural pronoun of reference. Now, which are to give the law to language, the grammarians or the writers? Here is a series of examples from Lord Berners to Ruskin in which the plural pronoun is *invariably* used, and De Foe and Bp. Warburton use the plural verb too. We may say that De Foe is not a model of correctness in the use of English, and perhaps Bp. W. is not either, but can we stigmatize the use of the plural pronoun as 'incorrect' when it is supported by all these writers over more than 300 years? It is a *constructio ad intellectum*, and there is no getting over it, however much it may conflict with notions of grammatical concord. We cannot denounce it, *Si volet usus, | Quem penes arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi.*

As Mr. Bradley includes *Everybody else* here, I wish that he had given some examples of the possessive, tracing historically that locution. Under *Else* we find *anybody else's*, in Pepys (1668), and *somebody else's*, in Saturday Review (1860), but no other examples.

This Part is chiefly taken up with the compounds of *Ex-*, 124 out of 144 pages, but we find nearly three pages, = nine columns, given to *Evil* and its compounds, and between seven and eight pages to *Eye* and its compounds. The familiar *Eyas* (Hamlet, II, 4, 355) is quoted with the first folio spelling, *Yases*, which form is not given in Schmidt's Shakespeare-Lexicon. It is carried back to 1486, The Book of St. Albans: "An hawke is calde an *eyes* of hir eyghen." This is an early instance of popular etymology, as the word is originally *nyas*, from French *niais* 'nestling,' with loss of *n*, as in *adder*. We miss the form *Eyrie, Eyry*, with cross-reference to *Aerie, aery*, under which Dr. Murray has already given the word. This is the more remarkable as the spelling *eyrie* occurs in several examples under *Eyas*. Both *Eyas* and *Eyrie* (all forms) are omitted in the Stanford Dictionary. According to the scheme they should have been included, as the one dates from the late 15th and the other from the 16th century. As showing the superiority of the N. E. D. to the Stanford Dictionary, we do not find in the latter *Exosmose*, though *Exosmosis* is given, but without example; similarly for *Endosmose* and *Endosmosis*, whereas the N. E. D. gives all four terms, with examples, although none are earlier than 1828-29, which shows that they are recent words. In the case of several words the Stanford Dictionary claims to have supplemented previous researches, but the N. E. D. has gone beyond it. The only two given which may be compared in this Part are *Exiture* and *Expulse*. The first is given in the Stanford with two examples, 1543 and 1578. The N. E. D. marks the word as '*Obs.*,' but divides the meanings. In the sense of a 'passage out or forth,' two examples are given, 1578 and 1615, the former being from the same work as in the Stanford. In the sense of 'a running abscess,' three examples are given, *c.* 1400, 1543 and 1657, the second example being the same as in the Stanford. There are added in the N. E. D. three examples of *Exitura* from medical dictionaries, 1811, 1860 and 1884. Under *Expulse, vb.*, the Stanford gives six examples, 1528, 1542, 1549, 1554, 1579 and 1591, none later than the 16th century. The N. E. D. gives *Expulse, n., obs.*, with one example from Golding's Ovid, 1565; but as *verb* it is characterized as "very common in the 16th–17th c.; now *Obs.*, though casual examples occur in 19th c." The meanings are subdivided into three paragraphs: under *a.* we have nine examples,

1432–50, *Higden*, to 1842, *Tait's Magazine*; under *b.* five examples, 1542 to 1823; under *c.* four examples, 1505 to 1767; besides seven additional examples of *Expulsed, Expulsement* and *Expulsing*, 1537 to 1691. The example under *b.* 1542, Boorde's Dyetary, is the only one that is common to the two works.

This brief comparison shows the thoroughness with which the N. E. D. is being worked up. I may add that under *Extravaganza*, a word directly in the line of the Stanford's work, we find four examples, all of the present century. In the N. E. D. we find three paragraphs of definition, with eight examples in all, two of which are from 1789 and 1794, the earliest, so that the word is not much more than a hundred years old. It deserves to be noted that we find also *Extravaganzist*, with *one* example from Poe: "1849 Poe, *Marginalia*, Wks. 1864, III 538, That . . . school of *extravaganzists* who sprang from the ruins of Lamb"; so perhaps Poe started that long list of words in *-ist*, which have become so common as slang in recent years.

But this brief notice must suffice by way of illustration of the work that is being so admirably done by Dr. Murray and his colleagues.

J. M. GARNETT.

Beowulf and The Fight at Finnsburh, with text and glossary on the basis of M. Heyne. Edited, corrected and enlarged by JAMES A. HARRISON and ROBERT SHARP. Fourth edition. Revised, with notes. Ginn & Co., Boston, 1894.

This attractive book came from the press near the close of the session of 1893–94, too late for regular class use in that academic term. We hope it is ere now in the hands of multitudes of students. The book is still known as Harrison and Sharp's; but we have authority for saying that the latest and best feature, the admirable body of notes to be discussed below, is the work of Professor Harrison alone.

The text differs very little from that of former editions. Perhaps those familiar with the Heyne-Socin book will be somewhat disappointed. There are about twenty changes in the direction of the Heyne-Socin edition; but the latter has about fifty changes not noticed by the American editors. An entirely new text is promised us in the not remote future. (See preface to 4th edition.) This we shall hail with delight. Why not have an out-and-out American edition of Beowulf? Heyne has given his book into other hands. His German *besorgers* carry no overwhelming authority. Why may not Prof. Harrison give us a text embodying the best results of recent Beowulf studies, calling to his aid students of the poem at home and abroad? This, with the notes recently added, will make our college classes practically independent of editions in foreign languages.

Of the changes in the text, the most important are as follows:

3d edition.	4th edition.
sêle raedenne (51)	*sele-raedende*
eafeðo (534)	*earfeðo*
hrinde (1364)	*hrimge*
âter-tânum (1460)	*âter-tedrum*
est (2158)	*eft*
helpan (2449)	*helpe*

In compounds, *win* has been changed to *wín*, e. g. ll. 655, 696, 715, 772, 994, 2457. The word *eoten* has been capitalized in ll. 1073, 1089, 1142, 1146. The *H* of *Húnferð* has been dropped. The much-disputed passage 899–903½ has been changed to follow H.-So. Much-needed corrections in punctuation are as follows: after *forsworceð* (1768) a semicolon; period after *bið*, in same passage, changed to comma. Several omitted hyphens have been inserted, e. g. *feor-cýððe* (1839), *mere-hrägla* (1906), *oncer-bendum* (1919), *sae-líðend* (2807), *ende-láf* (2814).

Of the textual emendations accepted by H.-So. and not by Harrison, we *miss* only a few: most of those passed over by the American editor being of rather doubtful propriety. We do, however, miss *healle* (101) for *helle, fledh* (1201) for *fealh, hâm* (2326) for *him*. (In connection with the second word we should cancel the third reference under *feólan* in the glossary. See p. 207, 4th ed.)

The glossary of proper names has been carefully retouched. *Hôce, sub voce Finn* and *Hildeburh,* has been changed to *Hôc. Heaðo-raemas reaches Breca* is changed to *H. reached by Breca. H* of *Húnferð* is bracketed. *Eotenas = subjects of Finn, North Frisians,* is given a place among proper names. (See above, under textual changes.)

The changes in the general glossary are numerous and valuable. Typographical errors, mistakes in reference, inconsistencies—in all about two hundred and twenty-five oversights—have been corrected. Of these improvements, some of the most important are:—The imaginary *felgan* has been substituted by *feólan*; so in the compound *ätfelgan.* Under *feónd-sceaða* change 'gleaming' to 'hostile.' Under *onfón* (last reference) change 'received' to 'clutched.' Under *begête* cancel 'to find, to attain,' and read 'attainable.' Under *bearu* and *hangian* change *hrinde* to *hrímge* and translate 'frosty, ice-clad,' instead of 'rustling.' Cancel *líhan* and *on-líhan,* and put *león* and *on-león.* Under *meðel* change definitions to 'assembly, council.' Under *on* (3d ed., p. 247, second column, near bottom) change 'against' to 'towards.' Under *scacan* change 'their strength (breath ?)' to 'their bravest men.' *Scânan* is abandoned. Under *tô* 'to the hall' (I 2) is changed to 'from a room.' Under *wäl-bledt* 'deadly-pale (?)' is changed to 'mortal, cruel.' Under *geweorðan,* definition 3 now reads 'to agree, decide,' and the bracket in first reference reads '(since many agreed that .. .).' In second reference 'happened (?)' is changed to 'advisable.' The present writer would recast this as follows: 'To this the friend of the Scyldings, the shepherd of the kingdom, has agreed,' etc. *þäs* = gen. *rei,* not = *therefore* (cf. Hall's Beowulf, p. 55). Under *wið* 4th ed. changes *eotena* (2 (*c*)) to *Eotena,* and render 'with the Eotens' sons.' Under *eald-fäder* Prof. Harrison discards the second definition of his own third edition and of the H.-So. In his note on l. 373 he suggests that the hyphen be omitted, and that *eald* be rendered by 'honored.' So that the note and the glossary conflict. This idea of rendering *eald* (B. 373) without reference to time or age is, in my opinion, eminently good. *Eald-fäder* and *eald fäder* were no doubt as distinct in A. S. as 'grandfather' and 'grand father' are in modern English. The various uses of 'old' in Shakspere are, of course, familiar to us all. In Virginia now, we have several of those uses still surviving. And, in addition to the wide-spread 'old fellow,' Virginians of the best classes have

the phrases 'old gentleman' and 'old lady,' which they often seriously apply to honored friends, and often to their own parents. The last-named phrase a gentleman often uses in addressing his wife in playful mood. I should like to know how this is elsewhere: with us no disrespect is dreamed of in any case referred to.

Under *âter-tedrum* the glossary is altered to suit the change from *tân* to *tedr*.

It is, however, impossible to multiply examples of the improvements in the glossary. Enough have been given to show that great care has been bestowed upon this part of the work, and that, even without the notes, Harrison's fourth edition would be a boon to Beowulf students.

The following misprints and oversights have been noticed:—P. 49, figure 1 lacking in numbering l. 1555. P. 139, 1607 should be 1617. P. 140, figures should read 1688–1699. P. 146, 'H.-So. p. 112' should be p. 113. P. 148, l. 2477 should be l. 2476, and reference to Ha. should be p. 84. P. 182, under *on-cirran*, for *wealdendas* read *wealdendes*. P. 192, under *dryhten*, 2483 should be 2484. P. 225, under *geóng*, 2019 should be 2020. P. 229, under *gearwor*, reference should be l. 3075. P. 237, under *for-grindan*, for 'feasts' read 'fastness'; cf. *fästen* in glossary. P. 238, under *grund-wong* change 2772 to 2771. P. 255, *hreóðan* should be *hreóðan*. P. 256, under *hring-mael*, 1562 should be 1565. P. 270, in first word cancel second *o*. P. 274, under *mägen*, 780 should be 790. P. 299, under *sceapan* the third reference should be pret. part. P. 305, under reference to l. 1840 read *him* for *hine*. P. 316, under *sum*, first bracket should read '(there shall naught be hidden).' P. 322, under *teón*, second reference, read 'a' for 'the' at beginning of sentence.

And now, having saved the good wine till the last, we come to the notes, pp. 117 to 156 inclusive. These constitute an epoch in Beowulf studies. They are scholarly, stimulating and suggestive, showing throughout the laborious and painstaking scholarship of their author. In this body of notes Prof. Harrison has brought together the latest and best results of Beowulf scholarship. The best emendations of Bugge, Sievers, ten Brink, and other recent critics of the text; the different renderings of translators, American and European; the happiest suggestions of Brooke, Earle, and other literary students of the poem—all these are brought together, in orderly arrangement, with consummate skill. Here, for the first time, the collegiate student of Beowulf has a good working apparatus in one handy volume. The quotations from the recent works of Earle and Brooke—both expensive for the average collegian—make these notes worth far more than the cost of the whole volume.

Of original suggestions and emendations, Prof. Harrison offers few. Some of these are worthy of special notice.

As to *eald* (l. 373) see above.

For *nát* (l. 682) he suggests *náh* (= *ne* + *áh*), and thus justifies the rendering 'he has not the ability,' etc. (Cf. 2253.)

Stedpne (927) he would translate 'bright.' His arguments are: (1) It is immediately followed by *golde fáhne*. (2) Chaucer (Prol., l. 201) has *his eyen stepe*; cf. Morris's note. (3) The word is used with same meaning in Ste. Marherete and in St. Kath.

In note to l. 2402 it is suggested that, Beowulf being essentially *the* Epic of Philanthropy, the number twelve may be reminiscent of another Friend of Man and another Twelve.

For *byrdu-scrûd* (l. 2661) Prof. Harrison suggests *beadu-scrûd* = battle-shirt (cf. 453).

The crux 3063½ ff. he would clear up as follows: For the first three words read *Wundraᵹ hwät þonne*, and translate 'The valiant earl wondereth then through what he shall attain his life's end, when he no longer may live. . . . So Beowulf knew not (wondered how) through what his end should come,' etc.

L. 3147 he suggests *wind-blonda lâc*, which would afford a parallel to *swôgende lêc*, suggested by Bugge.

In conclusion we desire to thank Prof. Harrison for this most timely and scholarly addition to his Beowulf labors, and to urge him to give us, very soon, a corrected and emended text, bringing his quantities and his notation to that high level reached in his glossary and notes.

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY.   J. L. HALL.

Euripides' Alcestis, edited by MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE, Doctor in Philosophy of Columbia College, Instructor in Greek at Barnard College, New York. Macmillan & Co., London and New York, 1894.

This little work, though intended for use in schools, has some of the features of a critical edition, and therefore merits more than casual notice in this Journal. The author is evidently one who weighs and tests his conclusions independently, and his book shows a degree of originality which is decidedly refreshing, especially in a school edition of so well known a play. The introduction is brief and clear, and is well adapted to interest and stimulate the student. Dr. Earle is a zealous opponent of the 'no-stage theory' of Dörpfeld, but the argument drawn from the analogy between the theatre and the Pnyx, upon which he lays so much stress (Introd., pp. xxxiv–xxxvii), does not seem very conclusive. Until the site of the Pnyx is determined with absolute certainty, the believers in Dörpfeld's view will refuse to attribute any great weight to the argument; and supposing that Messrs. Crow and Clarke are right in their identification, it is hard to see why the resemblance between Pnyx and theatre need extend to the arrangement of the stage. On the other hand, the argument as to the number of stage-doors necessary for the performance of some of the tragedies (ib., pp. xxxviii–xli) deserves more attention than it has hitherto received from the adherents of the Dörpfeldian theory. But the weightiest evidence in favor of the existence of a stage is surely the strong and persistent tradition that the actors spoke from some kind of an elevation, and there are many who think, like Dr. Earle, that the hypothesis of a low wooden stage or platform best accords with all the conditions of the problem, though they may not hold with him that this platform was surmounted by a βῆμα.

In his notes on the ὑπόθεσις of the play, Dr. Earle suggests that the words τὸ δρᾶμα ἐποιήθη ιζ̄ mean that the Alcestis belonged to the seventeenth group of plays brought out by Euripides. As he points out, the statement in the Γένος Εὐριπίδου that the poet's first appearance took place in Ol. 81, 1 agrees well with this supposition, which seems a very reasonable one. But the words λέλεκται δὲ τὸ δρᾶμα τοῦτο λ̄β̄ in the Aristophanic ὑπόθεσις to the Antigone can

scarcely mean that the latter play was brought out by Sophocles in the thirty-second year of his dramatic career. It is much more natural to suppose that they refer to the order in which the plays were read by the Alexandrian librarian in cataloguing them; and in any case the phrase is too vague to be of much service in determining the disputed date of the Antigone. Hence the coincidence noted by Dr. Earle (Introd., p. xxix) cannot be regarded as being at all decisive.

The text of the edition is, on the whole, a conservative one; but the editor has made some ingenious emendations, among which the following deserve special notice. In line 44 he reads πρὸς βίαν γ' for πρὸς βίαν σ'. In 59 he reads (with Dindorf) ὠνοῖντ' ἂν οἷς πάρεστι γηραιοὶ θανεῖν, rightly, as I believe. In 64 he reads κλαύσῃ for παύσῃι, thinking that the MS reading arose from a combination of κλαύσῃ with a gloss πείσῃ. This seems better than πείσει, the emendation of F. W. Schmidt. Κλαύσῃ certainly is admirably suited to the tone of the whole passage. In 237 he reads χθόνιον κατὰ γᾶς, transposing κατὰ γᾶς χθόνιον of the MSS. In 230 he retains οὐρανίῳ, but his defence of the reading seems unsatisfactory. Hipp. 1207 κῦμ' οὐρανῷ στηρίζον is a common nautical hyperbole, and is not parallel to such an extravagant expression as οὐράνιος βρόχος. The other passage which he cites in defence of his position, Androm. 830 ff., will not seem very strange to any one who has had his cloak whirled high aloft by the wind on a gusty day. Doubtless the right substitute for οὐρανίῳ has not yet been suggested, but unless some more conclusive evidence is forthcoming, I must hold, with Prinz and Wecklein, that the word is corrupt. In 254–5 he reads Χάρων καλεῖ μ' ἐπείγων· τί μέλλεις; for Χάρων μ' ἤδη καλεῖ τί μέλλεις ἐπείγου of the MSS. In 304 for ἐμῶν he reads σέβων. The emendation is palaeographically a good one, but is not τούτους ἀνάσχου δεσπότας σέβων δόμων too strong an expression for the respect felt by a father for his children? Wecklein's τρέφων seems to give better sense, though the change is a harder one. Line 321 Dr. Earle (with Mekler) brackets as being probably an interpolation. The present writer, for one, cannot see the difficulty in ἐς τρίτην μηνός which some editors have found. It does not seem unreasonable to suppose that the κύριον ἦμαρ on which Alcestis was to render up her life was the day on which debts were usually paid, the νουμηνία; and if so, the expression ἐς τρίτην μηνός is entirely natural, the sense being 'I shall not pay the debt of nature to-morrow nor the day after (third of the month), but to-day' (the first of the month). Why there need be any reference to 'extended payment' I am unable to discover. The day after the morrow is mentioned simply to strengthen the statement (cf. χθὲς καὶ πρώην, χθὲς καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν and similar expressions). 332–3 Dr. Earle retains, changing ἄλλως to ἄλλων. His defence of the two lines against Nauck is acute, and has much in its favor. In 458 he emends the MS reading to Κωκυτοῖό τε ῥείθρου. Κωκυτοῖς of S certainly seems to point to Κωκυτοῖο, and L actually has κωκυτοῖο by a later hand. The change from ῥείθρων (ῥείθρων L) to ῥείθρου is also an easy one; but the plural is much more frequently used than the singular, and probably should not be altered. If Pape may be trusted, Sophocles and Euripides *always* use the plural, though, to be sure, in Soph. Ant. 1124 lyr. most MSS, including L, give the singular. In 565 Dr. Earle reads σοί for τῷ, and in 566 αἰνέσεις for αἰνέσει. This seems to be right. Admetus would not

be likely to admit that his guest would censure his hospitable conduct, especially as it was not at all certain that Heracles would ever discover the real state of the case. In 631 he reads τοῦτον for τὸν σόν. Vv. 636–9 Dr. Earle rejects as spurious, thinking them to be an interpolation from another play. In 734 he reads ἔρρων, with the scholiast, instead of ἔρρον or ἔρροις. In 1071 he adopts Monk's conjecture ἥτις ἐστί for ὅστις εἶ σὺ of the MSS. If the change is to be made, should we not go a step farther and read εἴη for εἶ σύ? The optative in this construction is especially common with verbs of necessity like χρή (Goodwin M. and T. 555), and the change will be somewhat easier from a palaeographical point of view. In 1123–4 Dr. Earle transposes λεύσσω and λέξω. The change is ingenious but seems unnecessary, especially if we retain θαῦμα in 1123.

The explanatory notes are clear and concise, and err, if at all, in the direction of too great brevity. The edition is well adapted to stimulate discussion, and will be valuable to the critical student of Euripides as well as to the school-boy who is beginning the study of the drama. However much one may disagree with some of Dr. Earle's conclusions, the work is one to be heartily commended to lovers of classical learning.

H. W. HAYLEY.

REPORTS.

Janvier.

E. Philipon. Les Parlers du Forez cis-ligérien aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles. In 20 pages devoted to phonology and morphology and 24 pages of dialect texts, the author sets forth the character of the vernacular speech in the old province of Forez, north of the sources of the Loire.

A. Jeanroy. Trois dits d'amour du XIIIe siècle. These pieces, numbering respectively 193, 264 and 170 verses, and composed by Adam de la Halle, Névelon Amion and Guillaume d'Amiens between the years 1260 and 1280, had not been previously published. They are here critically edited, and accompanied by introduction, notes and glossary.

R. J. Cuervo. Las segundas personas de plural en la conjugacion castellana. Just as Americans of the United States have signalized their devotion to the speech of the mother-country by making a number of the most important contributions to English lexicography, so a Chilian and a Colombian of South America (Messrs. A. Bello and R. J. Cuervo, particularly the latter, in his revised edition of the *Gramática castellana* of the former and in his own *Diccionario de construcción y régimen de la lengua castellana*) have made the most valuable contributions to Spanish grammar. In the present article Mr. Cuervo discusses an interesting point in Spanish philology. In the 13th century all the 2d plurals of the Spanish verb except the imperative (*escuchad*) and the preterit (*escuchastes*) ended in -*des*. The history of their later development is treated under (1) forms originally paroxytonic, (2) forms originally proparoxytonic, (3) forms in -*tes*, (4) other analogical formations, (5) conjectures.

P. Meyer. Les manuscrits de Bertrand Boysset (*fin*). II. Recueil de morceaux variés (40 pages). Continued from vol. XXI 557-80.

Mélanges. P. Guilhiermoz. Une charte de Gace Brulé. "La vie de Gace Brulé, comme celle de la plupart des trouvères, est fort obscure : il vivait à la fin du XIIe siècle ; il était Champenois ; il passa quelque temps en Bretagne, où il avait été appelé par le comte Geoffroi II; il était chevalier. Voilà à peu près tout ce qu'on sait de lui, et ce n'est pas beaucoup. Aussi nous a-t-il paru intéressant de signaler une charte, datée de 1212, qui émane d'un seigneur nommé 'Gatho Bruslé.'"—A. Thomas. Les premiers vers de Charles d'Orléans. In his edition of the poems of Charles d'Orléans, Champollion-Figeac, by confusion, attributes to Louis d'Orléans, afterwards Louis XII of France, a short moral poem entitled *Le livre contre tout péché*. Three verses of the poem read as follows :

Ce livre, lequel, Dieu donnant,
Je nommé [*name erased*] d'Orleans
Fiz quant je eus acompli X ans.

The name to be restored is here shown to be Charles, and we are thus placed in possession of a boyish production of the distinguished poet.

Comptes rendus. Études romanes dédiées à Gaston Paris le 29 décembre 1890 (25e anniversaire de son doctorat ès lettres), par ses élèves de France et ses élèves des pays de langue romane (G. Paris). On the 9th of August, 1889, the fiftieth birthday of Professor Paris, he was presented with a volume of essays by his former Swedish students. The following year brought him a similar but more extensive anniversary testimonial, composed of studies by thirty-eight French savants, six Swiss and one Belgian. "Plus d'une, parmi ces contributions mêmes, dépasse les limites où j'ai le droit et le moyen d'exercer une critique utile ; la plupart sont en rapport plus étroit avec mes études habituelles. Quelques unes sont d'une haute importance ; toutes, je puis le dire bien sincèrement, ont de l'intérêt et de la valeur, et je ne puis qu'être fier et heureux de voir mon nom associé à des travaux aussi divers et aussi remarquables ... Je me rappelle qu'il y a vingt-cinq ans, dans la première leçon publique que je fis, aux cours libres de la rue Gerson fondés par M. Duruy, je disais que le vœu de tout professeur digne de ce nom pour chacun de ses élèves est le vœu d'Hector pour son fils :

Καί ποτέ τις εἴπῃσι · Πατρὸς δ' ὅγε πολλὸν ἀμείνων.

Ce vœu s'est réalisé pour plus d'un de ceux qui, venus de France ou de l'étranger, ont depuis lors trouvé dans mes cours et mes conférences leur première initiation à la science. En voyant la façon dont ils ont su développer et accroître le germe qui leur avait été confié, je me dis que ma carrière didactique n'a pas été inutile, et cela ne me fait pas seulement plaisir, cela me prouve que j'ai eu raison, contre l'avis de quelques conseillers bien intentionnés, de donner inflexiblement à mon enseignement la direction toute scientifique que je lui ai donnée, le tenant également à l'écart de toute préparation à un examen quelconque et de tout appel à l'intérêt d'un public étranger au travail : cela m'a valu quelques heures difficiles, où j'ai pu craindre de me trouver isolé, et, par suite, d'avoir choisi une mauvaise voie ; mais je suis aujourd'hui délivré de mes doutes et largement payé de mes peines."—W. Golther. Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur. Erster Theil. Von den ersten Anfängen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters (G. Paris). "M. Golther s'est fait connaître par des études approfondies, très personelles et très méritoires, quoique parfois un peu aventureuses, sur plusieurs des questions les plus intéressantes du sujet qu'il présente ici en résumé ... Toutefois, nous n'en parlerions pas ici si l'auteur n'avait donné à son exposé un caractère particulier, en y introduisant beaucoup plus intimement qu'on ne l'avait fait jusqu'ici l'étude de la poésie française du moyen âge.... C'est sur la matière de Bretagne que M. Golther, comme on sait, a fait des études spéciales ... L'élément celtique dans les romans bretons est assurément beaucoup plus

important que ne le dit M. Golther, suivant en cela M. Förster... La
vérité sur cette question, que M. Zimmer a posé avec tant d'éclat, mais
qu'il sent bien lui-même n'avoir pas résolue, se dégagera peu à peu des
recherches faites sans parti pris, et on verra certainement qu'il ne faut
exclure de la contribution à la matière de Bretagne aucune des trois régions
bretonnes, ni la Cambrie, ni la Cornouaille, ni l'Armorique, et qu'il ne faut
jamais oublier, derrière cette couche, relativement récente, où a germé la
poésie franco-bretonne, les assises plus profondes qui la rattachent à la
branche gaëlique de la race celtique."

Chronique. Eduard Mätzner, distinguished for contributions to Romance
and Germanic philology covering over half a century, died July 13, 1892,
at the age of 87 years. From 1858 to 1888, when he retired, he was
principal of an important girls' high school in Berlin. In 1843 appeared
the first volume of his *Französische Syntax*, in 1856 the first edition of his
Französische Grammatik, and in 1860 the first volume of his great *Englische
Grammatik*. He left unfinished the most extensive of his undertakings :
Altenglische Sprachproben, nebst einem Wörterbuche, the publication of
which was begun in 1867. [It was the characteristic boast of Mätzner, in
private intercourse, that his scientific productions were based exclusively·
on his own individual researches.]—Siméon Luce, member of the Académie
des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, professor at the École des Chartes, died
December 14, 1892, at the age of 59. Mr. Luce, who was devoted chiefly to
historical studies, edited for the Société de l'histoire de France the *Chro-
nique des quatre premiers Valois*, and eight volumes of the *Chroniques* of
Froissart (which will be continued by G. Raynaud), and for the Société des
anciens textes français the *Chronique du Mont-Saint-Michel.*—A new learned
review has been established in Italy, the *Rassegna bibliografica della lettera-
tura italiana*, under the competent direction of Prof. A. d'Ancona.—The
English collection of the Master of the Rolls (*Rerum Britannicarum Medii
Ævi Scriptores*) has been increased by the appearance of volume II of the
Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey, edited by Thomas Arnold. It contains
an original edition of the Anglo-Norman *Vie de Seint Edmond le Rei* by
Denys Pyramus. This text is even less satisfactorily edited than was that
of Gaimar, which appeared earlier in the same collection.

Livres annoncés sommairement (13 titles).

Avril.

W. Cloetta. Le mystère de l'Époux. This brief text, consisting of some
95 lines of mingled Latin and French, of which only about a third part is
French, seems to be the oldest dramatic piece preserved in any form of
Romance speech. It is here edited with elaborate introduction and critical
apparatus (52 pages).

A. Piaget. Simon Greban et Jacques Milet. In his *Complainte de la
mort de Millet*, Simon Greban, in enumerating the works of Milet, mentions
"Ung livre de grant excellence Nommé *la Forest de tristesse*," hitherto
supposed to have been lost. Mr. Piaget has discovered it in the *Jardin de*

Plaisance (printed for Antoine Vérard about the year 1500). The *Forêt de Tristesse* is a poem of some 5000 verses, written in 1459 in the allegorical manner of the *Roman de la Rose*, and is here briefly analysed, with extracts.

E. Picot et A. Piaget. Une supercherie d'Antoine Vérard: les *Regnars traversans* de Jehan Bouchet. Jehan Bouchet holds an honorable place among the French poets of the first half of the 16th century. The title of his first work, *Les Regnars traversans les perilleuses voyes des folles fiances du monde*, had been inspired by a Latin elegy of Sebastian Brant's, *Alopekiomachia, seu de spectaculo conflictuque vulpium*. Antoine Vérard, the great Paris bookseller, undertook the publication of Bouchet's poem, but what was the latter's stupefaction, upon the appearance of the work in a luxuriant illustrated edition two or three years later (in 1503), to find that his own name had been suppressed from the volume and that the title-page bore "par Sebastien Brand, lequel composa La Nef des folz [*Narrenschiff*] derrenierement imprimee a Paris." By means of a lawsuit Bouchet secured the recognition of his rights, and as an appropriate characterization of his experience caused himself to be known forever after as "le Traverseur des voyes perilleuses." Apropos of this incident, Mr. Picot suggests that the condemnation passed by A. Piaget, Romania, XXI 581, on Octavien de Sainct-Gelays for having (apparently) appropriated the greater part of the poems of Charles d'Orléans in a volume entitled *La Chasse et le Deport d'amours*, ought probably to have been addressed to the publisher of the work, our friend Vérard. In both cases the motive of Vérard's *supercherie* would have been the same, viz. to gain a wider sale for his books. Sainct-Gelays, it should be observed, had been dead for some seven years, when his name was attached to the plagiarized edition of the poems of Charles d'Orléans. Mr. Piaget appends a defence of his former position, in which the force of Mr. Picot's suggestion seems not to be broken.

Mélanges. A. Thomas. Le latin *-itor* et le provençal *-eire*. Thomas having explained (Rom. XXI 17) that Prov. *deveire* is Lat. *debitor* pronounced *debétor*, which latter is to be accounted for as an analogical formation : *-étor -étorem*, to correspond to *-itor -itorem* and *-ātor -ātorem*, Cornu took issue, explaining the development as *debitor > débitro > debitro*, which last would regularly give *deveire*. Thomas here rejoins that the Franco-Provençal *piscator = peschare*, but *latro = laro*, which shows that *piscator* did not pass through the stage *piscatro*; and what is true of Franco-Provençal is probably true of Provençal as well.—A. Delboulle. *Buissé, boissié, bouyssé, boissé.* "M. Godefroy, sous *Buissie*, explique cet adjectif par 'de bois ou de buis.' C'est une double erreur. Ce mot signifie seulement 'orné de buis' [*boxwood*]."—G. Doncieux. Fragment d'un miracle de sainte Madeleine. Restitution of the text of a fragment (78 verses) of an Anglo-Norman poem preserved in the library of Trèves.—A. Thomas. Chrétien de Troyes et l'auteur de l'*Ovide moralisé*. In two of the MSS of the *Ovide moralisé* the authorship of the poem is attributed to Chrétien Legouais. Thomas here shows that this name is probably a blundering misapplication of the phrase *Crestien li gois*, with which the author of the *Philomena* (incorporated in the *Ovide moralisé*) characterizes himself.

This latter Crestien is most probably the celebrated Chrétien de Troyes; while the *Ovide moralisé* is thus bereft of a sponsor.—E. Picot. Le Jeu des Cent Drutz dans le diocèse de Pamiers. "Dampnamus autem et anathematizamus ludum cenicum vocatum *Centum Drudorum*, vulgariter *Cent Drutz*, actenus observatum in nostra dyocesi etc."—A. Morel-Fatio. Sur Guillaume de Machaut. The name of Guillaume de *Machaut*, which was often misspelled *Michaut* even in France, is found disguised in certain Catalan citations of a Spanish work by Torres Amat, under the forms *Mechant, Mexaud* and *Maixaut.*—B. Hauréau. Jean de Hesdin, le *Gallus Calumniator* de Pétrarque. "Jean de Hesdin, religieux de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de Saint Jean, docteur en théologie, auteur de très gros commentaires sur différents livres de l'Écriture sainte, aurait certainement mérité que la postérité s'inquiétât de lui quand il n'aurait pas écrit contre Pétrarque et quand Pétrarque n'aurait pas écrit contre lui. Il n'est donc pas sans intérêt de faire un exact recensement de ses œuvres."— E. Picot. Complément de l'Oraison d'Arnoul Greban à la Vierge (173 verses).

Comptes rendus. De Nicolao Museto (gallice Colin Muset) francogallico carminum scriptore, thesim Facultati litterarum parisiensi proponebat Joseph Bédier (G. Paris). "[L'auteur] a surtout fait servir l'aimable *vielleur* du XIIIe siècle à appuyer la thèse (car s'en est bien une) qu'il soutient contre M. Jeanroy et en général contre tous ceux, ou peu s'en faut, qui ont parlé de la poésie lyrique française du XIIIe siècle : tous en ont relevé la banalité conventionnelle, le manque de sincérité dans le sentiment, et surtout l'extraordinaire uniformité . . . Mais [M. Bédier] prétend qu'avec un peu d'attention et de perspicacité on découvre bien vite dans la mise en œuvre de ce fonds commun des différences toutes personnelles, et il le prouve en étudiant comparativement les chansons de Conon de Béthune et celles de Colin Muset, où se révèlent non seulement deux existences, mais deux âmes et deux caractères poétiques très différents." M. Paris devotes ten pages to a series of exhaustive discussions and emendations.— Rev. Robert Williams. Selections from the Hengwrt MSS preserved in the Peniarth Library. Vols. I and II (G. Paris). Of these volumes the first contains *Y seint Greal*, "being the adventures of King Arthur's Knights of the Round Table in the quest of the Holy Greal, and on other occasions. Originally written about the year 1200. Edited with a Translation and Glossary"; and the second contains the *Campen Charlymaen*, etc. Vol. I appeared as early as 1876, when the death occurred of the Rev. Robert Williams, who left the texts and part of the translations of vol. II in the printer's sheets. The work was completed in 1892 by the Rev. G. Hartwell Jones. "Il est regrettable qu'elle n'ait pas été faite avec une meilleure méthode et un plus grand souci de l'utilité des lecteurs."—M. Lanusse. De l'influence du dialecte gascon sur la langue française de la fin du XVe siècle à la seconde moitié du XVIIe. Thèse présentée à la Faculté des lettres de Paris (P. Meyer). The influence of the Gascon on the French language was exerted chiefly in the 16th century. It was principally due, in the current speech, to contact with the *cadets* (younger sons) of Gascony (the word *cadet*, earlier *capdet*, is Gascon) who journeyed northward in

quest of fortune ; in the case of the literary language it is attributable to
the numerous Gascons who in the 16th century wrote in French. M.
Lanusse has sought to discover the traces of this double influence in
pronunciation, vocabulary and syntax. "Dans cette recherche il a fait
preuve de beaucoup d'érudition, mais il a, sur tous les points, exagéré sa
thèse."—Studî dialettali veneti : I. M. Goldstaub und R. Wendriner. Ein
tosco-venezianischer Bestiarius, herausgegeben und erläutert. II. F. Novati.
La *Navigatio Sancti Brendani* in antico veneziano, edita ed illustrata. III.
L. Luzzatto. I dialetti moderni delle città di Venezia e Padova (E. G.
Parodi). Minute critique of 14 pages.

Périodiques.

Chronique. "M. Henry A. Todd a été nommé professeur de philologie
romane à Columbia College, New-York."—"M. John E. Matzke a été
nommé professeur de philologie romane à l'université 'Leland Stanford
Jr.,' Palo Alto, Californie."—The French Institute has awarded the
Volney prize to the Abbé Rousselot for his book, *Les modifications phoné-
tiques du langage étudiées dans le patois d'une famille de Cellefrouin.*

Livres annoncés sommairement (46 titles).

Juillet.

G. Paris. La *Chanson d'Antioche* provençale et la *Gran conquista de
Ultramar* (*fin*). Continued from Rom. XVII (1888) 513-41, XIX (1890)
562-91. "Je crois donc que nous avons dans le fragment de Madrid et
dans les parties du poème auquel il appartient que nous a conservées la
Gran Conquista de Ultramar les restes de la *Canso d'Antiocha,* œuvre du
chevalier limousin Grégoire Bechada, attaché aux seigneurs de Lastours,
composée environ de 1130 à 1145. La valeur historique de ce poème ne
me semble nullement à dédaigner : il contient certainement beaucoup de
renseignements dus à des témoins oculaires. Mais il est surtout précieux
pour ce qu'on peut appeler l'histoire poétique de la première croisade. . . .
En somme, le poème de Grégoire Bechada, intéressant par sa date, par son
sujet, n'était pas à mépriser pour sa forme et paraît avoir justifié l'estime
qu'il avait inspirée aux contemporains. La découverte d'un fragment
original de ce poème et de la traduction partielle qu'en a faite la *Conquista*
apporte à la littérature provençale un véritablement enrichissement, et il
serait fort à désirer qu'on retrouvât en Espagne les restes, qui y subsistent
peut-être encore, du précieux manuscrit auquel appartenait notre fragment.
. . . Qu'est-il devenu depuis le XVIIe siècle ? C'est aux archéologues
limousins à le rechercher : il y aurait là une belle decouverte à faire."

L. Gauchat. Les poésies provençales conservées par des chansonniers
français (40 pages). Several manuscript collections of French chansons
preserve a number of pieces, in the aggregate considerable, of Provençal
verse. These are here enumerated in detail, assigned as fully as possible
to their respective authors, studied under various of their aspects, and, in
the case of one of the most important MSS, diplomatically reproduced.

Comte E. Cais de Pierlas et P. Meyer. Mémoire en provençal présenté, en 1398, au comte de Savoye par les Grimaldi de Beuil. Text of a document of some historical and linguistic interest, with remarks.

A. Piaget. Jean de Garencières (60 pages). Jean de Garencières is a personage so little known to history that there is some difficulty in identifying him among the Garencières of his time. He was the son of Jean de Garencières, seigneur de Croisy, and to distinguish him from his father he is commonly called Jeannet de Garencières. As a child, in 1396, he was a member of the "expedition de Hongrie"; in 1403 he is found in the retinue of the duc d'Orléans; in 1406 he and other knights are interdicted by letters royal from engaging in "certains joustes ou faiz d'armes" which they had organized; in 1407 he is taken prisoner by the English at the siege of Bourg, etc. The poetry of Garencières begins with a little poem entitled *L'enseignement du dieu d'Amours*, in which we learn how, while still a "jeune valleton," he has determined to "se bouter en l'amoureux mestier," and how, unfortunately for him, the blond damsel of his choice is "si gente, si longue, si droicte, si gracieuse," that she is already surrounded by a whole court of admirers. The MS Bib. Nat., fonds français 19139, contains fifty-one pieces, ballades, rondeaux, complaintes, etc., most of which are of the composition of Garencières, whose "devise amoureuse," prefixed to nearly all, is expressed in the words *Vous m'avez*. A considerable number are here published for the first time. One ballade, modernized and done over by two different rhymers, is printed in separate redactions in the *Jardin de Plaisance*; it reappears, at last in its original form, in this article. The most notable event of Garencières's literary career was his passage at arms with Charles d'Orléans. In the latter's *Poème de la Prison* appear two spirited ballades, one entitled *Orleans contre Garencieres*, the other *Response de Garencieres*. Charles d'Orléans, assuming for the moment to speak in the person of the *dieu d'Amour*, complains of the Don Juans of his time, and in particular of Garencières, "roy des heraulx pour bien mentir." The latter's rejoinder, addressed to Cupid, concludes as follows:

> Prince, s'on doit avoir vaillance
> Pour mentir a grant habondance
> Et pour faulseté maintenir,
> Vous verrez icellui venir
> A grant honneur, n'en doubtez mie,
> Qui, contre raison, veult tenir
> Le droit de vostre seigneurie.

A. Morel-Fatio. Notes de lexicologie espagnole. Treats half a dozen items of interest. The etymology of *cada* (every), conclusively shown by P. Meyer in 1873, from its use in Folk-Latin, to be Greek κατά, is here credited as a lucky guess to a Spaniard writing in 1791.—The MS of the *Cancionero de Baena* bears the following indication of its authorship: "el qual dicho libro ... fizo e ordeno e compusso e acopilo el *jndino* [i. e. *indigno*] Johan Alfonso de Baena." In vol. IV of his *Antología de poetas*

líricos castellanos, Menéndez Pelayo, on the strength of the exploded error that *judino* is the reading of the MS, would still make out that Alfonso de Baena was a *Jew*, in spite of the fact that no such form of the word for 'Jew' is known to have been ever used in Spain (or elsewhere), not to speak of the improbability that an author, under the circumstances, would have thus proclaimed his Jewish origin.—By the side of the regular subjunctive form *plega* of *placer* stands a form *plegue*, especially in the phrase *plegue á Dios* 'please God!' This is probably due to a confusion between the regular *plega á Dios* and the popular corruption (*plega*) of *prega* (Lat. *preca* or *precat*) *á Dios*, leading to the inference of a corresponding subjunctive form *plegue*.

Octobre.

A. Thomas. Les noms de rivières et la déclinaison féminine d'origine germanique. By declension of Germanic origin Mr. Thomas means the declension in -*ain*, admitting, however, that the implied origin of this declension is by no means accepted by all scholars. Jules Quicherat long since pointed out that certain names of rivers, which in Latin were of the 1st declension, present to-day in French a masculine termination in -*ain*, -*in* or -*ing* (le Loing, Lat. *Lupa*; le Mesvrin, Lat. *Magavera*; le Thérain, Lat. *Thara*). He supposes that the French names were formed by the addition of a suffix -*īnus* (*Lupinus*, *Magaverinus*, etc.). Lindström observed that the oldest documents had the forms -*ain* and -*ein*, but not -*in*. This led him to hesitate between an ending -*anus* and an accusative form in -*ain*. Thomas, following Longnon, believes that "les noms *Loing, Mesvrin*, etc., sont incontestablement des restes de l'ancienne déclinaison française et doivent être mis sur la même ligne que les deux débris conservés par la langue actuelle et souvent cités : *nonnain* et *putain*." (The explanation of these 'débris' is to be sought by Gaston Paris in a special article.) In good Latinity the names of rivers of the 1st declension are, with some exceptions, masculine; in the Low Latin period the masculine gender becomes exceptional, and the names in question may accordingly be considered to have been originally feminine in French; if they still later become masculine, it is doubtless under the influence of the numerous masculine terminations in -*ain*, -*ein* and -*in* (a similar case is that of a church in the diocese of Limoges, now called *Saint-Barbant*, but originally *Sainte-Barban = Barbain*). Quicherat had cited six of these names of rivers. Thomas declares that of some eighty river-names in -*ain*, -*in* or -*ien*, probably the greater part are to be explained in the same manner as *nonnain, putain*. He gives a certain number the origin of which may be considered certain, and a much longer list of names inviting scrutiny.

H. L. D. Ward. Lailoken (or Merlin Sylvester). The purpose of this paper is nowhere stated, nor does the well and favorably known author, who writes in English, vouchsafe to inform us anywhere in his 'Introductory Notes' what he means by "our Part I" and "Part II of our narrative," until we finally fetch up, absolutely without other premonition, at a "Part I.—St. Kentigern and Lailoken," which proves to be a face-to-face repro-

duction of a chapter from Bower's *Scotichronicon*, entitled 'De mirabili paenitentia Merlini vatis,' and of a hitherto unpublished portion of Cotton MS Titus A. XIX, with the indication, "Narratives of Lailoken, headed (in another hand) 'Vita Merlini siluestris.' In 2 Parts." Part II ("King Meldred and Lailoken") is mistakenly printed in different type from that used in Part I, by which the reader's comprehension of the article is still further bewildered. "People had certainly begun to identify Lailoken with Merlin, when the narrative in Titus A. XIX [which we are not told is in store for us] was written. It says of him : 'qui Lailoken vocabatur quem quidam dicunt fuisse Merlinum, qui erat Britonibus quasi propheta singularis, sed nescitur.' Again, Lailoken utters that prophecy about a triple death (in this case told of himself), which we regard as essentially Merlinesque, because we know it well in the French Romance. And lastly, at the end of Part II, when it has been told how he was buried at Drumelzier in Tweeddale, 'in cuius campo lailoken tumulatus quiescit,' the following couplet is added :

> Sude perfossus, lapidem perpessus, et undam,
> Merlinus triplicem fertur inisse necem.

In all other respects Lailoken is very different indeed from the semi-daemon who attached himself to the early Kings of Britain."

Mélanges. A. Thomas. D'un comparatif gallo-roman et d'une prétendue peuplade barbare. In the department of the Marne there is a commune officially known as *Courtisols*; the name was formerly *Courtisor*, and is pronounced to-day *Courtisou*. In his *Dict. topographique de la Marne* (1891) M. Longnon has : "*Courtisols, Curtis Ausorum,* semble avoir pour second élément le nom de quelque peuplade étrangère." But a document of the year 847 gives for *Courtisols* the Latin *Curtis Acutior*, which latter word, in its accusative form, would have regularly become, in French, *auisor.* Another example of *acutiorem* in the topography of Gaul occurs in the name *Montaguzon* (near Agen), in the 11th century *Montaguzor = Montem acutiorem.* For similar comparatives note "villa quae dicitur *Monte Subteriore*" (*Monsteroux*) and "in *Monte Superiore*" (*Monseveroux*). — A. Salmon. La laisse 144[1] du *Roland.* Argues in favor of the genuineness of the *laisse* (which is not found in the Oxford MS) and endeavors to establish the text.—J. Cornu. Révision des études sur le Poème du Cid. A considerable number of emendations and rectifications to the text of the *Poema del Cid.*—G. Huet. Sur l'origine du poème *De Phyllide et Flora* (of the *Carmina Burana*). From resemblances to characteristic peculiarities of the *chansons de geste*, the author argues in favor of French origin.—G. Paris. La chanson composée à Acre en juin 1250. Characterized by P. Paris as "cette belle chanson où l'on engage Louis IX à ne pas quitter la Terre Sainte avant d'avoir visité Jérusalem et délivré tous les chrétiens restés captifs." Here critically edited.—A. Salmon. *Entrecor—puin* (*helt*). "*Entrecor*—c'est une partie de la poignée, une sorte de bobine, renflée en son milieu . . . *puin*—c'est le pommeau. Mais *helt* n'est pas aussi sûr.—G. Paris. *Bédâne.* Il me paraît certain qu'il s'agit ici d'*ane*,

'canard' en anc. fr., et non d'*asne* ("*bec de canard*," and not "*bec d'âne*," as Littré spells the word).—A. Bos.   *Marmot, marmeau.*   "En résumé, *marmot*, ladin *marmont* < *murem montis*, a signifié d'abord marmotte, puis singe et, enfin, petit enfant.   Quant à *marmeau*, petit enfant (diminutif de *merme* < *minimum*), il s'est probablement confondu avec *marmot.*"—E. Langlois.   J. Molinet auteur du mystère de S. Quentin.   L'*Histoire de Monseigneur S. Quentin*, attributed to Molinet on internal evidence and MS testimony.—Ad. Hatzfeld, A. Thomas.   Coquilles lexicographiques.   Continued from Rom. XX 464, 616.

Comptes rendus.   Mémoires de la Société néo-philologique à Helsingfors (G. Paris).   "Rien n'est plus intéressant et plus digne de sympathie que les efforts que font depuis quelques années en Finlande un certain nombre d'hommes jeunes et convaincus pour y développer les études sérieuses de philologie moderne et spécialement de philologie romane ... Ils ont fondé, à Helsingfors, le 15 mars 1887, un *Club néo-philologique*, devenu en 1891 une *Société néo-philologique*, qui, de 17 membres, a passé, s'accroissant chaque année, à 88, et qui forme une base très solide pour l'action qu'ils poursuivent tant à l'université qu'a côté d'elle."—G. Rydberg.   Le développement de *facere* dans les langues romanes.   Thèse pour le doctorat (G. Paris).   "Cet ouvrage n'est pas seulement, comme l'auteur semble le dire trop modestement dans sa préface, un recueil de faits et un résumé d'opinions présentées antérieurement.   Le jeune philologue suédois auquel nous le devons apporte partout une critique très indépendante et généralement très perspicace, et sur plus d'un point les explications qu'il propose sont à la fois nouvelles et justes."—F. Ramorino.   La pronunzia popolare dei versi quantitavi latini nei bassi tempi ed origine della verseggiatura ritmica (G. Paris).   "Depuis quelques années on s'est occupé aux points de vue les plus différents des origines de la versification romane, qui est, comme on sait, fondée sur l'accent et le nombre de syllabes (l'assonance ou rime n'est qu'accessoire), par opposition à la versification classique, fondée sur la quantité et le pied ... Les travaux de MM. W. Meyer (de Spire), Kawczynski, Vernier, Havet, Henry, Thurneysen, Becker, Ronca, Stengel, d'autres encore, n'ont cependant pas, malgré le très grand mérite de plusieurs d'entre eux, réussi encore à l'élucider.   M. Ramorino nous apporte ici une solution nouvelle, qu'il regarde comme définitive, et qui mérite, tout au moins, d'être prise en très sérieuse considération, car si elle ne résout pas, à mon avis, le problème tout entier, elle en éclaire d'une façon qui me paraît décisive quelques-uns des côtés les plus obscurs."— J. Lair.   Étude sur la vie et la mort de Guillaume Longue-Épée (G. Paris). "Cette belle publication nous intéresse d'abord à cause de la nouvelle édition critique qu'y donne M. Lair du précieux petit poème rythmique ... sur la mort de Guillaume I de Normandie (943) ... ensuite à cause des nouveaux documents que le savant éditeur apporte à la curieuse question de la chanson de la *Vengeance Rioul* (voy. Rom. XVII 276)."—C. Steinweg. Die handschriftlichen Gestaltungen der lateinischen Navigatio Brendani; —F. Novati.   La Navigatio Sancti Brendani in antico veneziano (C. Boser). "L'étude de la légende, et plus particulièrement du *voyage océanique*, de

saint Brendan, a pris dans ces dernières années un nouvel essor ...
Cependant on est obligé d'avouer que le progrès accompli est loin de
répondre à un effort aussi multiple et aussi considérable ... Il me semble
que tout ce qui a été dit sur la question, après les travaux de Schröder,
Suchier et Zimmer, a presque autant contribué à embrouiller les choses
qu'à les éclaircir."—A. Stimming. Bertran de Born (A. Thomas). "La
nouvelle édition de Bertran de Born que vient de donner M. Stimming
diffère profondément de celle qu'il avait publiée en 1879, et se rapproche
tout à fait par la disposition matérielle, comme par le caractère intrinsèque,
de celle que j'ai donnée en 1888."—A. Devaux. Essai sur la langue
vulgaire du Dauphiné septentrional au moyen-âge (P. Meyer). "Cet
ouvrage est une thèse de doctorat presentée à la Faculté des lettres de
Grenoble. C'est sans doute l'une des meilleures thèses que cette Faculté
ait recues : à Paris même on en a admis qui ne la valaient pas. Le sujet
est bien limité, bien compris, traité avec compétence."—Ph. Aug. Becker.
Jean Lemaire, der erste humanistische Dichter Frankreichs (Ch.-M. des
Granges). "Du moins, les érudits et les critiques ne pourront se dispenser
de le consulter, et tout en faisant leurs réserves sur le mérite absolu de
Jean Lemaire, ils jugeront avec nous que M. B. vient d'écrire d'une
manière aussi définitive que possible un des plus intéressants chapitres de
l'histoire de la littérature française au XVIe siècle."

Périodiques. Apropos of a highly important article by A. Horning in
the Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XVII 160 sqq., *Ueber Dialekt-
grenzen im Romanischen*, G. Paris writes at length : "Dans cette très inté-
ressante étude, M. H. résume avec beaucoup de clarté le débat qui s'est
élevé entre les romanistes depuis le mémorable article de P. Meyer sur le
franco-provençal et la question des dialectes et de leur limite ; il oppose à
l'opinion de Meyer, que j'ai adoptée ainsi que MM. Gilliéron, Schuchardt,
Gauchat et la plupart des philologues, des objections diverses, toutes
réfléchies et dignes d'attention. ... En résumé, la position que prend
dans la discussion en question un savant de la valeur et de la circonspec-
tion de M. Horning est assurément un fait important, et plusieurs de ses
remarques méritent d'être prise en sérieuse considération ; mais je ne puis
trouver qu'il ait réussi à ébranler une théorie qui me paraît toujours être
absolument simple, conforme à la nature des choses telle que nous pouvons
la concevoir, et confirmée par la plupart des observations qui ont été faites
avec la rigueur et l'absence de parti pris désirables."—*Publications of the
Modern Language Association of America* (G. Paris). L. E. Menger. The
Historical Development of the Possessive Pronoun in Italian. "Cet excel-
lent travail, fait avec autant d'application que de méthode, éclaire vérita-
blement le sujet auquel il est consacré."—*Studies and Notes in Philology
and Literature* (G. Paris). "Nous accueillons avec grand plaisir cette
annonce et ce spécimen qui est fort intéressant." G. L. Kittredge. The
Authorship of the English *Romaunt of the Rose.* "Contrairement à l'opinion
de M. Lounsbury, qui revendique pour Chaucer cette traduction dont on ne
possède que 7700 vers, M. K., après une étude fort attentive et fort métho-
dique, conclut que le *Romaunt* n'est pas de Chaucer, à l'exception peut-être

des 1704 premiers vers (exception admise par MM. Kaluza et Skeat)."—
E. S. Sheldon. The Origin of the English Names of the Letters of the
Alphabet. "Étude excellente, qui intéresse la philologie romane et spéci-
alement française tout autant que l'anglaise."

Chronique. Eduard Schwan died at Giessen, his native place, July 27,
1893, at the age of 35 years. After having been *privat-docent* at Berlin, and
having lectured at Breslau for one semester as substitute for Prof. Kosch-
witz, he had just been appointed professor of Romance philology at Jena
when he was stricken by a fatal malady. For one of his years his publi-
cations were important. The second edition, completely rewritten, of his
Grammatik des Altfranzösischen appeared in the year of his death. Although
open to frequent criticism, it is by far the best grammar of Old French
phonology and morphology.—The Académie des Inscriptions has awarded
the La Grange prize to Émile Picot for the publication, in collaboration
with the late Baron James E. de Rothschild, of the *Mystère du Viel Testa-
ment*, under the auspices of the Early French Text Society.—A *Société des
parlers de France* has been organized at Paris, under the presidency of
Gaston Paris, and the vice-presidency of Paul Meyer and Jules Gilliéron.
The membership fee has been placed at 6 francs, which covers the price
of subscription to the *Bulletin* of the Society.—More recently there was
constituted in Paris the *Société d'histoire littéraire de la France*, MM. G.
Boissier president, and Petit de Julleville and Dezenneris vice-presidents.
The annual fee is 20 francs, including subscription to the organ of the
association, the *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France.*—The first instal-
ment of an *Altfranzösische Grammatik* by Prof. H. Suchier has made its
appearance. It is conceived on a different plan from that of the lamented
Prof. Schwan, and will be considerably more extensive.—M. Longnon has
discovered in a MS of the Paris National Library a wellnigh complete copy
of Froissart's lost romance of *Méliador*.

Livres annoncés sommairement (17 titles). Theophilo Braga e la sua obra,
por T. Bastos (pp. ix, 508). Theophilo Braga has written some hundred
volumes; he has composed poems, tales, works philosophical, aesthetic,
sociological, political; he is in Portugal the representative of Positivism
and the leader of the Republicans. At the same time, he is the historian
of Portuguese literature. "Son œuvre inégale, disproportionée, contra-
dictoire en bien des pages (suivant que l'auteur a passé de l'école de
Hegel à celle de Comte, ou qu'il s'est exalté pour les Germains, les
Arabes ou les Touraniens), est en tout cas une mine de faits prodigieuse-
ment riche et aussi une mine d'idées qui, pour n'être pas toujours bien
approfondies et bien sévèrement contrôlées, n'en sont pas moins fort
souvent originales et quelquefois remarquablement justes et fécondes."
As a folklorist he has gained wide recognition. Braga was born at Ponta
Delgada (Azores), February 24, 1843. He is preparing a new edition,
entirely recast, of his great History of Portuguese Literature.

                                                    H. A. Todd.

BEITRÄGE ZUR ASSYRIOLOGIE UND SEMITISCHEN SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT, heraus-
gegeben von FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH und PAUL HAUPT. Dritter Band,
Heft I (pp. 1–188). 1895.

The first Heft of the third volume of the Beiträge contains three articles of
considerable length.

The first of these (pp. 1–59) is a study by C. Brockelmann of the *Kitâb al-
Wafâ fi faḍâil al-Muṣṭafâ* of *Ibn Ǧauzî*, according to the Leiden Manuscript.
This work belongs to that class of writings in which, since the fourth century
after the close of the great canonical collections of Islâm, the Mohammedan
scholars attempted to arrange according to later points of view and to turn to
some practical use the constantly accumulating mass of religious tradition.
Brockelmann points out that while the majority of these works were religio-
legal in character, that of Ibn Ǧauzî was written solely in the interest of
science and of education. Ibn Ǧauzî in his introduction states as his reason
for producing such a work that many of his co-religionists had a very imperfect
knowledge of the real excellence of the character of the Prophet. Although
it is true that such a statement had become at that time almost a stereotyped
formula, it is evident that the author's object was to collect and present in a
convenient compass the chief credible traditions regarding the virtues of
Mohammed. The themes of the work are the personality of the Prophet, his
activity as a teacher and as an opponent of error, his private life and death,
and his final appearance on the Day of Judgment. Ibn Ǧauzî was not
content, however, merely to collect and set forth the views of others. He
occasionally not only criticises the historical value of his material, but in
some instances ventures into theological discussions and even into lexico-
graphical explanations.

Brockelmann gives in chronological order the chief sources of Ibn Ǧauzî's
work (pp. 8–27). This is not a difficult task, because, with few exceptions,
whenever a tradition is mentioned, the author, in accordance with the demands
of the strict traditional style, gives a full *Isnâd*, or citation of the unbroken
line of authorities for the tradition back to the original written source, and
then the list of authorities upon which that depended back to one of the
Prophet's companions, from whom the tradition originated.

Brockelmann closes his treatise with twenty-eight selections from the text
of Ibn Ǧauzî's work (pp. 28–59).

Siegmund Fränkel's article on sporadic sound-change in the Semitic lan-
guages (pp. 60–86) is really a criticism and correction of certain views expressed
by Barth in his Etymologische Studien.[1] Fränkel recognizes the necessity of
a systematic treatment of Semitic etymology, and admits the excellence and
thoroughness in many points of Barth's work in this field. His chief objec-
tion to the results of Barth's investigations, however, is that the latter
attributes all sound-change merely to phonetic influences. Fränkel formally
states as his theses against such a view (pp. 61–62) that sporadic sound-change
arises from the fact that when a word is attracted by the analogy in meaning
of some other word representing the same class of ideas, the first word becomes

[1] Etymologische Studien zum semitischen, insbesondere zum hebräischen Lexicon (Leipzig,
1893).

also phonetically similar to the second, and, furthermore, that words related in sense and similar in sound actually assimilate in meaning; that the meaning of a word can be specialized by the influence of another word which is similar in sound and related in sense.

As an example of the first phenomenon of sound-assimilation, Fränkel cites the identity of the Arabic رفس and the Hebrew רמס 'to tread.' In this case the change of the middle radical is due to the influence of the stem רמש 'to creep,' which is analogous in meaning to רמס. As an instance of an assimilation in meaning, he mentions the Hebrew stem נגע, the original meaning of which was 'touch.' The further development into the meaning 'smite' (cf. נֶגַע 'plague') was caused by the influence of the two stems נגף and נגח, both of which are similar in sound and of allied meaning.

Fränkel expresses grave doubt as to the correctness of Barth's assumption of numerous cases of metathesis, by means of which he arrives at new derivations and etymologies (p. 63). Thus, in the case of אַבְנֵט 'a girdle,' which Barth considered identical with اطنابة, Fränkel calls attention to the fact that اطنابة means not 'a girdle,' but 'a small strap for fastening the girdle.' He considers, moreover, that the pronunciation of אַבְנֵט, as indicated by the traditional vowelling, is strongly suggestive of אַבְרֵךְ, which is certainly a foreign word. In view of this, and also because, according to his view, the words חגר and מזח 'bind, gird' are probably of foreign origin,[1] he adheres to Barth's first opinion, expressed in his 'Nominalbildung,' 226, l. 2, as well as to that of Erman (ZDMG. 46, 110), that the word אַבְנֵט is of Egyptian origin (from the stem *bnd* 'bind'). Fränkel does not mention, however, that the stem طنب, seen in اطنابة, appears also in the Arabic طُنُب and the Syriac טונבא 'tent-rope.' The Arabic word means also 'a tendon of the body' and 'the root of a tree,' and the general signification of the stem seems to be 'to be crooked,' hence 'intricate,' from whence the derivatives 'tent-rope' and 'strap.' There is a stem *ṭapânu* in Assyrian, probably 'to bend, direct, rule,' from which the well-known *miṭpânu* 'bow' is a derivative, and which appears in II R. 27, 23 in connection with the word for 'chariot,' *ṭapânu ša narkabti*, in such a way as to seem synonymous with *çamâdu* 'bind, fasten.' In II R. 34, 41 also, the noun *ṭappanu* is given as a synonym of *çindu ša asi* 'a physician's bandage.' In view of the similarity both in form and meaning of the Assyrian *ṭapânu*, the Arabic طنب and the Hebrew (א)בנט, it does not seem impossible, in spite of Fränkel's objection, that Barth may be right in assuming that it may not be necessary to seek the derivation of אַבְנֵט outside of Semitic.

---

[1] חגר (with غ) is represented by the Assyrian *igâru* 'an enclosing wall' and *ugâru* 'a field.' מזח is usually considered cognate with the Arabic حزام 'a girdle' (cf., however, ZDMG. 46, 112, 116).

Fränkel rightly objects (p. 67) to Barth's identification of שמד 'destroy' with the Arabic سلم 'to stop up,' because the latter is probably a cognate of the Hebrew סתם 'to stop up,' used of wells and springs. שמד is, however, undoubtedly a cognate of the Assyrian *šamâtu* 'to cut off,' found in II R. 67, 24: *uxinušu ašmuṭma* 'I cut off his revenue' (?). The familiar adjective *šamṭu* 'sharp' is a derivative of this stem.

Fränkel doubts also (p. 77) the identity of Arabic قتين 'thin, feeble' and the Hebrew קָטֹן 'small,' owing, as he states, to the existence of the Ethiopic form *qaṭîn*, cited by Barth himself. Fränkel thinks that the Hebrew word is cognate rather with قُطْن = קוטנא = 'cotton.' It seems probable, however, that such a form as the Arabic قتين with ת may be connected with similar forms with ט, because the latter consonant might arise from an original ת, by a partial assimilation, either to the initial ק or to the final ן, according to its proximity to either consonant. In such a form as قُطْن the ת may have become ט by being brought into vowelless proximity with the final ן. We may suppose that the Assyrian form *nadânu* with *d*, as opposed to the Hebrew נתן and the rare Assyrian *natânu* with ת (Strm. K, 662, 38), arose in some such way as this.

After a number of highly interesting and scholarly comments on Barth's work, omitting, however, the discussion of all derivations bearing on the Assyrian, Fränkel closes his treatise with some valuable remarks regarding the nature of etymological work in general. He warns scholars that etymological comparisons do not usually admit of mathematical proof, but frequently depend rather on the ingenuity and imagination of the investigator. This is particularly true in the case of Semitic etymological work, because we have such scanty lexicographical remains of some of the languages. Bearing this in mind, Fränkel hesitates to admit the possibility of such an extensive occurrence of metatheses between the various dialects as that implied by Barth's work. He adds that an absolute similarity in meaning between many words, with only a slight variation in sound, is frequently the cause of comparisons based on metathesis and sporadic sound-change. As soon, however, as the slightest suspicion arises that in one dialect the word in question has obtained its meaning in the written language, either as a final product of a long period of development or as a metaphor, it is evident that the investigator must abandon his comparison.

Fränkel finally lays down, as follows, the lines along which the student of Semitic etymology must do preliminary work before the study is placed upon a sound scientific basis:—

I. All certain cases of sporadic *sound-change* within the individual Semitic languages should be collected, always bearing in mind, however, the influence of the dialect on the written language.

II. All certain cases of *sound-agreement* between the different Semitic languages should be collected.

III. First all the metaphors peculiar to the individual Semitic languages, and then the transitions in meaning shown by cognate roots in the different languages, should be collected. These investigations should be carried on upon the broadest possible basis, with most careful consideration of the modern Semitic dialects, and in some cases even of non-Semitic languages, because the creative imagination which influences speech often produces similar figures and metaphors in totally distinct languages.

Fränkel's article gives the impression of being the thoughtful work of a most conscientious and cautious scholar.

The third and last article in the Beiträge is a most elaborate historical treatise on the fall of Nineveh and the prophetic writing of Nahum of Elkosh (pp. 87–188). This work, which is the result of the combined labors of Colonel Adolf Billerbeck and Dr. Alfred Jeremias, is divided into three chapters, both authors sharing the labor of the first two, while the third is entirely the work of Col. Billerbeck.

The first chapter (pp. 87–106) contains a translation of Nahum's oracle against Nineveh, with an historical and Assyriological commentary, while the second (pp. 107–49) is a history and description of the city of Nineveh from earliest times until its downfall.

The opinion held by a number of commentators on the book of Nahum (for example, Schrader, KAT.³, p. 452), that the prophet's vivid allusion to the destruction of Thebes (3, 8. 10) shows that the siege of that city must have been still fresh in the popular memory, and that consequently the oracle must date from very shortly after 664 B. C., is very properly objected to (p. 95). As has been pointed out by previous commentators, it is perfectly possible to suppose that an Israelitish prophet might refer many years afterward to this great triumph of the Assyrian arms, and see in it a prophetic type of Assyria's own downfall.

On p. 96 the writer offers the interesting suggestion that the מפיץ of Nahum 2, 2. 4 (which he reads מֵפִץ) may have been the Scythian horde, instead of the first Median attacks against Nineveh, which would have been hardly sufficient to awaken the prophet's hope to the extent implied by the oracle. A comparison of Jer. 6, 22–3, which is usually regarded as a reference to the Scythian invasion of Palestine, seems to lend probability to this assumption.

The expression שׁערי הנהרות of Nah. 2, 7 is explained (p. 101) as alluding to the filling up of the great ditches which were intended to protect Nineveh in case of siege.

The second chapter closes (pp. 139–49) with a brief but interesting discussion of the origin and development of the Medes as a people, the records relating to their various attacks on Nineveh, and the way in which the city must have been approached by the enemy in the final siege, which must have lasted more than two years. The author doubts the truth of the tradition that Nabopolassar of Babylon aided the Medes directly in their overthrow of Nineveh. His idea is that Nabopolassar more probably concentrated his forces on weakening the Assyrian power in the Euphrates valley, leaving the actual siege of Nineveh to Cyaxares alone.

The third and last chapter (pp. 149–88) is an archaeological and scientific

military description by Col. Billerbeck of ancient Assyrian fortifications, and a treatise on their use in the warfare of the period, illustrated with numerous plates. It is followed by three maps explanatory, respectively, of Nineveh and the surrounding country, of the fortifications of Nineveh, and, finally, a general map illustrating Nahum's prophecy and the overthrow of the Assyrian capital.

Billerbeck and Jeremias' article should be consulted by every one interested in the Book of Nahum and the later Assyrian history.

UNIVERSITY OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK. J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

BRIEF MENTION.

Mr. RICHARD HORTON-SMITH'S *Conditional Sentences in Greek and Latin* (Macmillan) is based on his *Outline of the Theory of Conditional Sentences in Greek and Latin*, published as long ago as 1859. The plan is to lay down a scheme of possible combinations, which scheme, of course, involves the assumption that the author's views as to the constituent parts of the hypothesis are correct, and then to arrange under these categories the various phenomena of the language. There must be a fair field and no favor, above all no tampering with MSS; and εἰ ἵστησι, εἰ στήσειε, ἐὰν στήσῃ must not be allowed to absorb our attention, to the exclusion of εἰ ἐστήξει ἄν, ἐὰν ἐστηκὼς ἂν εἴη and ἐὰν ἐστήκει ἄν. Now, with such a conception of the task, it is not in human nature to resist the temptation to fill out the scheme, and it requires deeper study than Mr. HORTON-SMITH has given the subject to appreciate fully the silences of language. For Mr. HORTON-SMITH, as we learn from his preface, has been withdrawn for a generation from the practice of teaching as well as from the currents of philological thought, and while he has amused himself with arranging under the different rubrics of his scheme a number of interesting examples, his processes seem strangely old-fashioned, now that everybody recognizes the limitations imposed by time, sphere, department, dialect. To be sure, such considerations as these are not altogether absent from Mr. HORTON-SMITH's lucubrations, but his observations are sporadic and not systematic, and herein lies the characteristic difference between the syntax of to-day and the syntax of Mr. HORTON-SMITH's beloved and revered teachers. Acute observers have never been lacking in the domain of Greek syntax, and it not unfrequently happens that the best thing has been said or implied in advance of modern formulation. Whoever gave the name αἰτιατική to the accusative thought more truly than most persons who have treated of the case since. Nay, before there was an αἰτιατικὴ πτῶσις in grammar, Plato had meditated profoundly on the nature of the grammatical object, and in his Euthyphron gives the key to the periphrasis with the participle. Aristotle, to cite only one small matter, lays down the correct doctrine for the position of article, adjective and substantive, and Dionysios, however taught, appreciated more clearly than some modern commentators the significance of Thukydidean syntax. The same thing may be said of modern syntacticians from Gottfried Hermann down. But that is no good reason for keeping deliberately aloof from the paths that have been opened by recent research and for thanking one's stars that the law left leisure only for the kind of amusement that Mr. HORTON-SMITH has found in getting together the variegated contents of his bulky volume. For after all it would seem that the conditional sentence has merely

furnished a series of pegs from which to hang a number of literary game-bags, and the index reveals what we Americans would call in our mercantile way a 'job lot' of curiosities. Who would expect, for instance, in a treatise on the conditional sentence to be told of 'Adversity, its sweet uses,' 'Alfieri, his terseness,' 'Camoens, his poetic denunciation of naval enterprise,' 'Lord Chesterfield on proverbs,' and so on? Much of this extraneous matter is delightful, if one have a soul above grammar, but grammar is a severe study, and one is apt to be resentful when one contemplates seven hundred pages largely made up of what German scholars call *allotria.*

In a well-known passage of his *Poetisch-dialektische Syntax* (54, 3, 7), Krüger says that the frequency of the potential optative without ἄν is in inverse proportion to the excellence of the MSS. The better the MSS, the fewer the occurrences. This, he adds, is especially true of the minor orators; and so the recent editors of the minor orators, notably Blass, have very little scruple in restoring ἄν to such optatives. Of course, it is perfectly possible to take a diametrically opposite view, and to maintain that the authors that were most read were worst doctored. From this point of view the text of the minor orators may be regarded as a valuable museum of constructions that have escaped the processes of restoration such as have made the antiquities in some of our museums little better than forgeries. Such is or was the point of view of Herr Willibald Roeder, who some dozen years ago published sundry recalcitrancies against any change in the text of Isaios and against Cobet's changes in particular. Unquestionably, if you want 'sports,' you can always find them by looking into what prejudiced people will call poor texts. But a 'sport' remains a 'sport,' and isolated constructions cannot be made into a category without the most cogent reasons. If δεῖ σ' ὅπως occurred but once in Greek, a textual emendation might have suggested itself, but as there are three—all, to be sure, in dramatic poetry—we must try to get at the secret of the sudden shift from the expected infinitive to the ὅπως construction. So the combination of an anticipatory condition into a logical condition such as we find in Antiphon 6, 4 ἄν τις κτείνῃ τινὰ ὧν αὐτὸς κρατεῖ καὶ μὴ ἔστιν ὁ τιμωρήσων is perfectly explicable. κρατεῖ is too much for the normal ᾖ which we find in a similar passage below (§5). An interesting irregularity occurs in the Timocratea, and what is still more interesting is the fact that the whole speech may be regarded as a protest against that irregularity. It is, as it were, a double γραφὴ παρανόμων, a protest against *ex post facto* law and at the same time a protest against *ex post facto* syntax. εἰ τινι τῶν ὀφειλόντων δεσμοῦ προστετίμηται ἢ τὸ λοιπὸν προστιμηθῇ (D. 24, 41) is therefore doubly bad. οἶμαι, says the orator (§72), οὐδὲ ἕν' ἄνθρωπον ἄλλον τολμῆσαι νόμον εἰσφέροντα ἐπὶ τῷ χρῆσθαι τοὺς πολίτας αὐτῷ τὰς κατὰ τοὺς πρότερον κυρίους νόμους κρίσεις γεγενημένας ἐπιχειρῆσαι λύειν. This, at all events, is an instructive sport. But in Hippocr. de Prisc. Med. I, p. 8 F = I, p. 20 K, ὅπερ εἰ μὴ ἦν ἰητρικὴ ὅλως μηδ' ἐν αὐτῇ ἔσκεπτο μηδ' εὕροιτο μηδέν, it is simply absurd to keep εὕροιτο, which is not a passive and cannot mean 'were to have been discovered.' We must simply change εὕροιτο into εὕρητο, with Ermerins. It is an everyday case of itacism. Mr. HORTON-SMITH cites further (p. 49)

Eur. Or. 1132, but may it not be better to take μεθεῖμεν, with the scholiast, as aor. ind., and not as opt., with Goodwin (M. T. 508), or as 'subj. of the past,' with Mr. Horton-Smith? The unreal condition of an action that is decided, and so virtually past, is much more vigorous.[1] Comp. νῦν δὲ below. In Lys. 10, 9 εἰ τίς σ' εἴποι πατραλοίαν ἢ μητραλοίαν, ἠξίους ἂν ... ᾤου ἂν there is undoubtedly a shift, but it is just such a shift as one finds in illustrative hypotheses, hypotheses that are meant for arguments. So we find Isokr. 18, 57 ὅμοιον ἐργαζόμενος ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ τῳ Φρυνώνδας πανουργίαν ὀνειδίσειεν ἢ Φιλοργὸς ὁ τὸ Γοργόνειον ὑφελόμενος τοὺς ἄλλους ἱεροσύλους ἔφασκεν εἶναι. In a long sentence cited from Plat. Alc. Pr. 111 E there is a shift from the ideal to the unreal—a *grata neglegentia* of which we must not make too much by insisting on minute shades of difference; nor, on the other hand, are we to forsake so good a MS as the Clarkianus in Plat. Theaet., 147 A, in order to bring in a *difficilior lectio*. These are the comments that suggest themselves on one page of Mr. Horton-Smith, and there are many pages that might be annotated at the same length. So something might be said about εἰ with subj. εἰ w. subj. is an old generic form which survives here and there in dramatic poetry, for the most part as a bit of epic affectation to which the tragic poets were not superior. Wherever it shows itself in model prose it is more than suspicious. ἐάν has usurped its place, and that is all. To make a distinction between εἰ w. subj. and ἐάν w. subj., and translate the former *if haply* and the latter *if truly*, is futile. Mr. Horton-Smith wishes to have a Greek syntax that is good for all Greek. Now, is there any conceivable reason why we should never find *if truly* in all Pindar? Is it not, on the other hand, conceivable that the conservative poet should have stuck to the old formula just as he clung to the dying ὄφρα? In Theocr. 5, 64 αἰ λῇς is translated *if haply you shall be so desiring*, where λῇς seems to be clearly present indicative = εἰ βούλει. So 8, 85; 11. 56, whereas αἰ κα λῇς (5, 21) is ἢν βούλῃ. The future sense comes from the character of the verb. Of course, the Hippocratean corpus yields as many monsters as fabled Africa did of yore, and we are taught that there is a peculiar virtue in combining ἢν with a variety of indicatives which only need a slight change of accent to become normal subjs. But these specimens of Mr. Horton-Smith's method must suffice, showing as they do most clearly the utter hopelessness of reconciling his way of looking at things with the processes of recent grammatical thought which he has seen fit to ignore. There is a good deal of material which may serve by way of illustration, there are occasional *obiter dicta* which show native perspicacity. But the only men who can safely use the book will not take the trouble to explore the mass of irrelevancies for the sake of a happy turn here and a good remark there. A man who treats εὕροιτο as if it were εὑρεθείη puts himself out of court and cannot expect to have much weight attached to his undoubtedly just contention (p. 168) that ἐάν in Greek has no parallel construction in Latin, which better grammarians than Mr. Horton-Smith do not seem to have found out.

[1] See A. J. P. XIII 503.

Dr. HOLDEN's edition of *Plutarch's Life of Pericles* (Macmillan) is con-
structed on the lines of his other Plutarchean work with which every
scholar is by this time familiar. In this volume, as in the others, there is
no lack of instructive detail, and the young student can learn much besides
Plutarch's Greek from the ample commentary and from the valuable
indexes. Of course, where there is so much detail, there is always room
for criticism of the petty sort. One misses a word about the avoidance of
hiatus in τοῖς ὅλοις, c. IV 3, 35. It is impossible to take a thinker very
seriously who shifts from singular to plural for the sake of euphony, and
the ταῖς ἀληθείαις of Isokrates always calls up a smile at the expense of that
rhetorical soul. ταῖς ἀληθείαις, so common in later Greek, occurs but once
in the Demosthenean corpus, and then in XLIV, and Blass might have
added this phrase to the rest of his objections to the speech which he
belabors unmercifully. To be sure, the author is careless as to the hiatus
in the body of the speech, but he is careful in the prooemium, and ταῖς
ἀληθείαις is a cheap and familiar device. At c. VIII 4, 30 one wonders that
an editor of Aristophanes should have disdained to quote Eq. 571 foll.,
and c. VIII 6, 48 might have had a note on φησὶν ὅτι, that unmistakable
sign of later date. C. XXXI 4, 31 ἐνετύπωσε is translated '"cut in relief" or
"intaglio,"' which is, to say the least, enigmatical, and it is quite too polite
to translate Ἀσπασίᾳ συνόντα, c. XXIV 4, 33, 'by his marriage with Aspasia.'
The Life of Plutarch which is prefixed to some of the other volumes is
repeated here, and to this there will be no serious objection, but it would
have been well either to substitute or to add some general characteristic of
Plutarch's style. The students for whom these volumes were prepared are
not sufficiently advanced to gather up the many items of the commentary
into a literary portrait. True, the matter far outweighs the manner, but
the philosophic *causeur* of Chaeronea introduces too many new-fangled
words into Greek, and is a decided corrupter of youth, from the stylistic
point of view.

The mention of Aspasia recalls a chapter in v. WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLEN-
DORFF's *Aristoteles und Athen*—a work of manifold interest and incitement
—in which he takes up the Aspasia legend with his wonted asperity (II 99).
He protests, and not without reason, against making Perikles a Maecenas
or a Lorenzo de' Medici, and as a part of his thesis he assails Aspasia in
Aristophanic or rather Dikaiopolitan style. Aspasia, he maintains, was
nothing more to Perikles than Herpyllis was to Aristotle. No decent
woman in Athens could have been called Aspasia, and while the Ionians
were not so particular, Aspasia was a favorite hetaira-name even among
them, and the tradition that she had a father, Axiochos of Miletos, is offset
by the other tradition that she was a Carian. Really this is abusing the
proverb ἐν Καρὶ κινδυνεύειν. However, Wilamowitz, if ungallant, is inter-
esting, and goes on to explain the origin of the Aspasia-myth. Aischines,
the Sokratic, took it into his head to make what we should call a Ninon
out of her, and idealized her so far as to represent respectable people as
visiting at her house, among them Xenophon and his wife—a droll
anachronism. Still, Xenophon was pleased at this compliment, and

returned it after the fashion of his time—and our time. In Mem. 2, 6, 36 Aspasia is represented as past mistress in the art of matrimonial negotiations, and in Oec. 3, 4 she is cited as a person experienced in managing an establishment—no excessive praise. This is the way in which the Egeria of Perikles was started, and, once started, she was taken up by the author of the Menexenos. Of course, Wilamowitz is incensed at the revived belief that the Menexenos was written by Plato, who was not the man to make a heroine out of an hetaira. "It is no small sign," he adds, "of the dignity of Attic history that only one female figure occurs in it—only one, but she dominates it throughout: The Virgin of the Acropolis." All this is sadly old-fashioned, but it may be mentioned that in the same chapter Wilamowitz draws a picture of Perikles which it is a pleasure to read after soiling one's self with the scandalous stuff that Plutarch has heaped up about the name of the great Athenian, to the effacement of his noble image. But the work of Perikles, W. insists, was the work of a great statesman, not of a universal genius. Parthenon and Propylaea, he contends, are no more evidence of his taste than the creations of Schinkel are evidences of the taste of Frederick William III, and all the rhetoric about the intimacy with Pheidias, the community of ideas between statesman and sculptor, is rubbish. Pheidias was and continued to be a βάναυσος in the eyes of Perikles and men of his stamp. Such plain speaking helps to clear the philological air, even if some of us find the draught too strong, and close the windows hermetically with a shiver, as in a German lecture-room.

———

The fourth volume of FREEMAN'S *History of Sicily* (Macmillan & Co.) brings the narrative down to the death of Agathocles. The gaps in the MS have been filled by the insertion of passages from the author's small *Story of Sicily*, by copious footnotes, and by supplements placed at the end of the chapters they illustrate. All this is the work of Mr. FREEMAN'S faithful friend and devoted son-in-law, Mr. ARTHUR J. EVANS, whose utilization of recent numismatic discoveries adds a personal element and a special value to this labor of love.

———

Many of the emendations of the *Appendix Vergiliana* that have been published by Professor ROBINSON ELLIS in this Journal (see III 271–84, VIII 1–14, 399–414, XI 357, XV 469–94) have been accepted by PAPILLON and HAIGH in their beautiful pocket edition of all the works of *Vergil* (New York, Macmillan), a *lepidus novus libellus* which recalls Catullus and the editor of Catullus. The volume is a delight to the eye, the type is clear, and the paper that marvel of thinness and strength which is generally reserved for sacred literature of another school. The only fly in the ointment that I have noticed thus far is *fat*I for *fat*A in the ominous words of Turnus, Aen. 9, 136–7 : sunt et mea contra | *fata* mihi.

Those who have studied Professor BLASS'S excellent little manual, *Hermeneutik und Kritik* (A. J. P. VII 274), must have been struck with the number of illustrations drawn from the New Testament. This would not be surprising in an English scholar, but in a German classical philologian of our day it is noteworthy, especially as Professor BLASS'S tone towards the Greek of the N. T. is one of greater allowance than is common among professed students of Attic. The student of Attic, if he does not sympathize with the Emperor Julian in his sneer at the language of the Gospels, is prone to consider the Greek of the New Testament as a means of grace. It brings him down to the level of the common people who heard the Word with all readiness, and bids him associate with freedmen and other lightly esteemed persons, one Philologus among them, whose very names show their humble origin. But though such a lesson is of the greatest spiritual importance, it is better not to make phrases about it, and BLASS's method of treating the language of the N. T. is far the more excellent way. In his *Hermeneutik u. Kritik*[2], S. 199, he maintained that the writers of the N. T. handled imperfect and aorist, durative and complexive tenses with remarkable precision, and this *dictum*, coming from one who has made special studies in the imperfects and aorists of such a master as Demosthenes (A. J. P. XI 107), is not to be rejected lightly. Nor has he repented of his *dictum* in his *Editio philologica* of the *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht), a book which will doubtless give the editor all the trouble he anticipates from the theologians, but cannot fail to be warmly welcomed by men of his own guild. It is true that the chapter of the *Prolegomena* which deals with the language of the N. T. is somewhat disappointing. One craves much more. But the close observation of the peculiarities of the author of the Acts, and the perpetual comparison of the language with that of standard prose, make this edition one of unique practical importance. The student of classical Greek will come back to his special studies in Attic 'immunified' against post-classic microbes, and the theological student will gain a truer vision of the shades of culture in the early church.

———

After marshalling all the evidence obtainable about the *Pronunciation of the Greek Aspirates* (London, D. Nutt), Miss ELIZABETH A. S. DAWES, M. A., D. Lit. (Lond.), has arrived (pp. 102–3) at certain 'broad conclusions,' which in her judgment are not 'such as to justify a final decision in favour <of either> of the two opposed theories,' 'the aspiratic' and 'the spirantic.' The 'straddle,' to use an undignified Americanism, is somewhat disappointing.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Aristotle. Theory of Poetry and Fine Art; with a critical text and a translation of the Poetics by S. H. Butcher. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. 384 pp. 8vo, cl., net $3.25.

Brugmann (K.) A Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages. V. 4. Morphology. Pt. 3. Verbs; formation of the stem and inflection and conjugation; from the German, by R. Seymour Conway and W. H. D. Rouse. New York, *B. Westermann & Co.*, 1895 [1894]. 20 + 613 pp. 8vo, cl., net $5.

Burn (Rob.) Ancient Rome and its Neighborhood : an illustrated handbook to the ruins in the city and Campagna. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. 292 pp. (Bohn's Illustrated Lib.) 12mo, cl., $2.25.

Demosthenes. Philippics. School ed., by Evelyn Abbott and P. E. Matheson. Pts. 1-3. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. 53 pp. 16mo, cl., net 80 cts.

Egyptian Book of the Dead; ed. with introd., a complete translation, etc., by C. H. S. Davis, M. D., with 99 full-page il. and 27 designs. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1894. 4to, cl., $5.

Hammond (Basil E.) The Political Institutions of the Ancient Greeks. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. 122 pp. 8vo, cl., net $1.25.

Holm (Adolf). The History of Greece, from its commencement to the close of the independence of the Greek people. Authorized tr. from the German. In 4 v. V. 1. Up to the end of the sixth century B. C. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 432 pp. 12mo, cl., $2.50.

Homer. Odyssey, books 13-18; with introd., notes, etc., by W. W. Merry, D. D. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. 104 pp. 12mo, cl., net 90 cts.

Pater (Walter H.) Greek Studies; arr. for publication by C. Lancelot Shadwell. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. 319 pp. 12mo, cl., $1.75; édition de luxe, cl., net $3.

Sonnenschein (E. A.) A Greek Grammar for Schools. In 2 pts. Pt. 1. Accidence; pt. 2. Syntax. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 354 pp. 12mo, cl., 2 pts. in 1 v., net $1.25.

Xenophon. Selections Illustrative of Greek Life from the minor works, by C. Haines Keene. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 117 pp. (Elementary Classics.) 18mo, cl., net 40 cts.

ENGLISH.

Aristotle's Politics. A revised text, with introduction, analysis and commentary, by Franz Susemihl and R. D. Hicks. Books 1–5. 8vo, 694 pp. *Macmillan.* Net 18s.

Baker (W.) Latin and Greek Translations. Cr. 8vo. *Longmans.* 3s. 6d.

Becker (W. A.) Charicles. Trans. by Rev. Frederick Metcalfe. New ed. Cr. 8vo, 520 pp. *Longmans.* 3s. 6d.

—— Gallus. Trans. by Rev. Frederick Metcalfe. New ed. Cr. 8vo, 530 pp. *Longmans.* 3s. 6d.

Brunnow (R.) Chrestomathy of Arabic Prose Pieces. Cr. 8vo. *Williams & Norgate.* 10s.

Corpus Poetarum Latinorum. Ed. by J. P. Postgate. Fasc. 2. Fol., sd. *Bell & Sons.* 9s.

Euripides. Iphigenia in Tauris. Performed by members of Cambridge University. Drawn and etched by R. Farren. Fol. *Macmillan.* Net 10s. 6d.; la. pap., with proofs, net 21s.

Hewitt (H. M.) and Beach (G.) Manual of Our Mother-Tongue. 10th ed. 2 vols. Vol. 2. Cr. 8vo, vii + 391 pp. *W. H. Allen.* 2s. 6d.; vols. 1 and 2 in 1 vol., 5s.

Homer's Iliad. Book 24. With introduction, notes and appendices by G. M. Edwards. (Pitt Press Series.) 12mo, 70 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse.* 2s.

Horace. Odes and the Carmen Saeculare. Trans. into English by W. E. Gladstone. 3d and popular ed. Cr. 8vo, 150 pp. *Murray.* 3s. 6d.

Jataka, The; or, Buddhist Birth Stories. Trans. from the Pali, under the editorship of E. R. Cowell. Vol. 1. Roy. 8vo. *Cambridge Warehouse.* Net 12s. 6d.

Lindsay (W. M.) The Latin Language: an historical account of Latin sounds, stems and flexions. 8vo, 660 pp. *Clarendon Press.* 21s.

Livy. Book 6. Ed. by E. S. Weymouth and G. F. Hamilton. Cr. 8vo, 204 pp. *Bell & Sons.* 2s. 6d.

Marriott (H. P. Fitzgerald). Facts about Pompeii. Illust. 4to, 84 pp. *Hazell.* 7s. 6d.

Nepos (Cornelius). Select Lives. With notes and vocabulary for beginners, by E. S. Shuckburgh. (Pitt Press Series.) 12mo, 86 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse.* 1s. 6d.

Phyfe (William Henry P.) Five Thousand Words often Misspelled. Cr. 8vo, viii + 303 pp. *Putnam's Sons.* 5s.

Plato's Republic: the Greek text. Ed., with notes and essays, by the late B. Jowett and Lewis Campbell. 3 vols. Roy. 8vo. *Clarendon Press.* 42s.

Pliny. Selections from the Letters; by Charles Haines Keene. (Elementary Classics.) 18mo, 130 pp. *Macmillan.* 1s. 6d.

Plutarch's Life of Pericles. With introduction, critical and explanatory notes and indices, by Hubert Ashton Holden. 12mo, 360 pp. *Macmillan.* 4s. 6d.

Postgate (J. P.) Corpus Poetarum Latinorum. Tom. 1. 4to, 612 pp. *G. Bell & Sons.* Net 21s.

Properti Carmina recognovit Ioan. Percival Postgate. 4to. *Bell & Sons.* Net 3s. 6d.

Ramsay (W.) An Elementary Manual of Roman Antiquities. With numerous illusts. 9th ed. Cr. 8vo, 280 pp. *C. Griffin & Co.* 4s.

Rea (A.) South Indian Buddhist Antiquities. With 47 plates. 4to, 62 pp. *Luzac.* 12s. 6d.

Sacred Books of the East. Vol. 45. Gaina Sûtras. Trans. from Prakit by Hermann Jacobi. Part 2. 8vo, 490 pp. *Clarendon Press.* 12s. 6d.

Sallust. Jugurthine War. Edited, with introduction, notes and vocabulary, by Edward P. Coleridge. (Elementary Classics.) 18mo, 188 pp. *Macmillan.* 1s. 6d.

Schreiber (Th.) Atlas of Classical Antiquities. Ed. for English use by Prof. W. C. F. Anderson. With a preface by Prof. Percy Gardner. Oblong. *Macmillan.* Net 21s.

Seyffert (Oskar). Dictionary of Classical Antiquities. Revised and edited, with additions, by Henry Nettleship and J. E. Sandys. With more than 459 illustrations. 3d ed. Royal 8vo, 710 pp. *Swan Sonnenschein.* 10s. 6d.

Small (G.) A Grammar of the Urdu or Hindustani Language in its Romanised Character. Cr. 8vo. *Thacker.* 6s.

—— Francis (C. R.) and Nash (Mrs. Fraser). Anglo-Urdu Handbook or Hindustani Guide for the Use of Medical Practitioners in Northern India. Cr. 8vo. *Thacker.* 6s.

Smith (B. E.) The Cyclopaedia of Names. Folio, 1088 pp. *T. Fisher Unwin.* Net 42s.

Tacitus. The Agricola and Germania. Trans. into English by R. B. Townshend. Cr. 8vo, 98 pp. *Methuen.* 2s. 6d.

Thucydides. Book 1. Ed., with introduction and notes, by W. H. Forbes. With maps, introduction and texts. 8vo. *Clarendon Press.* 8s. 6d.

Virgil. Opera omnia. Recensuerunt T. L. Papillon et A. E. Haigh. (Clarendon Press Series.) Printed on writing paper. 18mo. *Clarendon Press.* 5s.; on Oxford India paper, 6s.

FRENCH.

Bailly (A.) Dictionnaire grec-français, rédigé avec le concours de M. E. Egger, à l'usage des élèves des lycées et des collèges. In-4. Cart., 15 fr.

Combe (Ernest). Grammaire grecque du Nouveau Testament. Gr. in-8. Lausanne, *Fischbacher.* Cart., 4 fr.

Gouin (François). L'art d'enseigner et d'étudier les langues. Texte français, fascicule I. In-12. *Fischbacher.* 2 fr. 50.

Hassano Bar Bahlule. Lexicon syriacum. Edidit et notulis instruxit Rubens Duval. Fasciculus quartus. In-4. *Leroux.* 20 fr.—L'ouvrage aura 5 fascicules.

Mellerio (L.) Lexique de Ronsard, précédé d'une étude sur son vocabulaire, son orthographe et sa syntaxe par L. Mellerio et d'une préface par Petit de Julleville. In-16. *Plon.* Cart., 6 fr.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische, hrsg. v. Rich. Förster. 7. Bd. 4. Hft. gr. 8. Breslau, *W. Koebner.*—4. De Hyla, scripsit Gust. Türk. 99 S. m. 4.50.

Acta martyrum et sanctorum, (syriace) edidit Paulus Bedjan, Cong. Miss. Tom. V. gr. 8. xi, 705 S. Parisiis. L., *O. Harrassowitz in Komm.* m. 24.

Aeschylos' Agamemnon, m. erläut. Anmerkgn. hrsg. v. Rob. Enger. 3. Aufl., nach der 2., v. Walth. Gilbert umgearb., neu bearb. v. Thdr. Plüss. gr. 8. viii, 187 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 2.25.

Alfārābī's Abhandlung der Musterstaat, hrsg. v. Frdr. Dieterici. gr. 8. xvii, iv, 84 S. Leiden, *E. J. Brill.* m. 4.

Anthologia latina sive poesis latinae supplementum, edd. Franc. Buecheler et Alex. Riese. Pars II. Carmina latina epigraphica, conlegit Franc. Buecheler. Fasc. I. 8. 398 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 4.

Ausgaben u. Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der romanischen Philologie. Veröffentlicht v. E. Stengel. 92. Hft. gr. 8. Marburg, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.*—92. Der Roman du mont Saint-Michel v. Guillaume de S. Paier. Wiedergabe der beiden Handschriften des Brit. Museums v. Paul Redlich. viii, 88 S. m. 2.80.

Bartholomäus (Wilh.) Verdeutschungs-Wörterbuch. gr. 8. viii, 210 S. Bielefeld, *A. Helmich.* m. 3; geb., m. 4.

Beiträge zur Assyriologie u. semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. 3. Bd. 1. Hft. gr. 8. 188 S. m. 30 Abbildgn. u. 3 Karten. L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 13.50.

Bierbaum (F. J., Ph. D.) History of the English Language and Literature from the Earliest Times until the Present Day, including the American literature. 3d ed. School ed. gr. 8. viii, 245 S. Heidelberg, *G. Weiss Verl.* m. 2.60; geb. in Leinw., m. 3.

—— dasselbe. Student's ed. 3d ed. gr. 8. viii, 265 S. Ebd., m. 3; geb. in Leinw., m. 3.80.

Borchardt (Wilh.) Die sprichwörtlichen Redensarten im deutschen Volksmunde. In gänzl. Neubearbeitg. hrsg. v. Gust. Wustmann. 5. Aufl. gr. 8. x, 534 S. L., *F. A. Brockhaus.* m. 6; geb. in Leinw., m. 7.

Brugmann (Karl). Die Ausdrücke f. den Begriff der Totalität in den indogermanischen Sprachen. Progr. gr. 4. iii, 80 S. L., *A. Edelmann.* m. 2.

Bruns (Ivo). De Xenophontis Agesilai capite undecimo. gr. 4. 21 S. Kiel, *Universitäts-Buchh.* m. 1.20.

Catonis disticha de moribus. Iterum ed. Geyza Némethy. gr. 8. 82 S. Budapest. m. 2.

Cauer (Paul). Anmerkungen zur Odyssee. Für den Gebrauch der Schüler. 1. Hft. *a–ζ.* gr. 8. vi, 110 S. B., *G. Grote.* Kart., m. 1.20.

Cicero. Ausgewählte Briefe Ciceros u. seiner Zeitgenossen. Zur Einführg. in das Verständnis des Zeitalters Ciceros. Hrsg. v. Frdr. Aly. 4. Aufl. gr. 8. viii, 167 S. B., *R. Gaertner.* m. 1.60; geb. in Leinw., m. 2.

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum, consilio et auctoritate academiae litte-

rarum borussicae editum.   Vol. VI, pars IV, fasc. I.   Fol.   B., *G. Reimer.*
Kart.—VI. Inscriptiones urbis Romae latinae, collegerunt Guil. Henzen
et Johs. Bapt. de Rossi, Eug. Bormann, ed. Chrn. Huelsen.   Partis IV
fasc. I.   v u. S. 2459–3001.   m. 58.

Curtius (E.) u. Kaupert (J. A.)   Karten v. Attika.   1 : 25,000.   Mit erläut.
Text hrsg.   8. (Schluss*)Hft.   5 Blatt à 46.5 × 40 cm.   Farbendr. u. kolor.
Berlin, *P. Reimer.*   m. 13.

Delitzsch (Frdr.)   Assyrisches Handwörterbuch.   2. Tl. ר—ב.   gr. 8.
S. 225–368.   L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*   m. 9.

Dümichen (Joh.)   Zur Geographie des alten Aegypten.   hoch 4.   vii, 80
S. m. 6 Taf. u. 3 Karten.   L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*   Kart., m. 22.50.

Erzgraeber (Geo.)   Elemente der historischen Laut- u. Formenlehre des
Französischen.   gr. 8.   vi, 52 S.   B., *R. Gaertner.*   Kart., m. 1.

Flensburg (Nils).   Zur Stammabstufung der mit Nasalsuffix gebildeten
Präsentia im Arischen u. Griechischen.   gr. 8.   72 S.   Lund, *Hj. Möller's
Univ.-Buchh.*   m. 2.25.

Gesenius' (Wilh.) hebräisches u. aramäisches Handwörterbuch üb. das
Alte Testament.   In Verbindg. m. Alb. Socin u. H. Zimmern bearb. v.
Frants Buhl.   12. Aufl.   Lex.-8.   xii, 965 S.   L., *F. C. W. Vogel.*   m. 15;
geb., m. 17.50.

Gomperz (Henr.)   Tertullianea.   gr. 8.   79 S.   Wien, *A. Hölder.*   m. 1.60.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft.   Hrsg. v. Iwan v.
Müller.   6. Bd.   3. Tl. (20. Halbbd.)   Lex.-8.   München, *C. H. Beck.*—
VI 3.   Archäologie der Kunst v. Karl Sittl.   3. Tl.   xx u. S. 625–953.
m. 5.50 (6. Bd. kplt., m. 16.50; geb., m. 18.50).

Herodot in Auswahl, hrsg. v. Karl Abicht.   Text.   gr. 8.   iv, 275 S. m.
1 Karte.   L., *B. G. Teubner.*   Kart., m. 1.80.

Holthausen (Ferd.)   Lehrbuch der altisländischen Sprache.   I. Altislän-
disches Elementarbuch.   gr. 8.   xv, 197 S. m. 2 Tab.   Weimar, *E. Felber.*
m. 4; geb. in Leinw., m. 5.

Hommel (Fritz).   Sumerische Lesestücke.   gr. 4.   viii, 144 autogr. S.
München, *H. Lukaschik.*   m. 20.

Hübschmann (H.)   Persische Studien.   gr. 8.   iii, 287 S.   Strassburg,
K. J. Trübner Verl.   m. 10.

Ibn al-Qûṭiyya, Abû Bakr Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz, il libro
dei verbi, pubblicato da Ignazio Guidi.   gr. 8.   xv, 381 S.   Leiden, *E. J.
Brill.*   m. 12.

Ibn Qasîm al-Ghazzî, Fath al-Quarîb, la révélation de l'omniprésent.
Texte arabe, publié et traduit par L. W. C. van den Berg.   gr. 8.   xvi,
742 S.   Leiden, *E. J. Brill.*   m. 13.75.

Inscriptiones graecae insularum maris Aegaei.   Consilio et auctoritate
academiae litterarum regiae Borussicae editae.   Fasc. I.   Fol.   B., *G.
Reimer.*   Kart.—I. Inscriptiones graecae insularum Rhodi, Chalces, Car-
pathi cum Saro, Casi.   Ed. Frdr. Hiller de Gaertringen.   Accedunt tabulae
geographicae III ab Henr. Kieperto descriptae.   viii, 241 S.   m. 30.

Kluge (Frdr.)   Deutsche Studentensprache.   8.   xi, 136 S.   Strassburg,
K. J. Trübner Verl.   m. 2.50; geb. in Leinw., m. 3.50.

Koegel (Rud.) Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters. 1. Bd. Ergänzungsheft. gr. 8. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner Verl.* m. 1.80.—Die altsächsische Genesis.

König (Fr. Ed.) Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache. 2. Hälfte. 1. Thl.: Abschluss der speziellen Formenlehre u. generelle Formenlehre. gr. 8. xiv, 602 S. L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 16 (I u. II 1, m. 32).

Löbel (Theoph.) (Lobel-Effendi). Elemente turçestǐ, arǎbeştǐ şi persane in limba românǎ. gr. 8. xxiv, 104 S. Konstantinopel, *O. Keil.* m. 4.

Muller (H. C.) Alt- u. Neugriechisch. 1. Hft. Einleitung in die alt- u. neugr. Grammatik. gr. 8. 35 S. Leiden, *E. J. Brill.* m. —85.

Roehl (Herm.) Imagines inscriptionum graecarum antiquissimarum, in usum scholarum iterum composuit R. gr. 4. iii, 87 S. B., *G. Reimer.* m. 6.

Scartazzini (A.) Grammaire italienne. Nouvelle méthode. 8. ix, 185 S. Davos. Genf, *H. Stapelmohr in Komm.* Kart., m. 3.

Schöne (Alfr.) Ueb. die Alkestis des Euripides. Rede. gr. 8. 27 S. Kiel, *Universitäts-Buchh.* m. 1.20.

Schrader (Herm.) Der Bilderschmuck der deutschen Sprache in Tausenden volksthümlicher Redensarten. 2. Aufl. gr. 8. xx, 543 S. Weimar, *E. Felber.* m. 6; geb. in Leinw., m. 7.

Schwartz (E.) Die Königslisten des Eratosthenes u. Kastor. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. in Göttingen."] gr. 4. 96 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. 10.

Sidonius, C. Sollius Apollinaris, recensuit Paul. Mohr. 8. xlviii, 394 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 4.

Studien zum germanischen Alliterationsvers. Hrsg. v. Max Kaluza. 3. Hft. gr. 8. Weimar, *E. Felber.*—3. Die Metrik der sog. Caedmonschen Dichtungen m. Berücksicht. der Verfasserfrage. Von Frdr. Graz. viii, 109 S. m. 4.

Studien, semitistische. Hrsg. v. Carl Bezold. 4. u. 5. Hft. gr. 8. Weimar, *E. Felber.*—4, 5. Die neu-aramäischen Handschriften der königl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, in Auswahl hrsg., übers. u. erläutert v. Mark Lidzbarski. 1. Tl. iv, 320 S. m. 20.

Tallqvist (Knut L.) Die assyrische Beschwörungsserie Maqlû. [Acta societatis scientiarum fennicae, tom. XX, No. 6.] 2 Thle. in 1 Bd. gr. 4. 179 u. 98 S. L., *E. Pfeiffer.* m. 48.

Textbibliothek, altdeutsche, hrsg. v. H. Paul. Nr. 1. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.*—1. Die Gedichte Walthers v. der Vogelweide. Hrsg. v. H. Paul. 2. Aufl. iv, 201 S. m. 2.

Winckler (Hugo). Altorientalische Forschungen. III. gr. 8. L., *E. Pfeiffer.* m. 6; geb., m. 6.50.—III. Noch einmal die babylonischen königstitel. Bemerkungen zu den Assurbanipalinschriften. Eine urkunde aus der babylonischen kleinstaaterei. Bemerkungen zu den funden v. Nippur. Untersuchungen zur Bavianinschrift. Eine inschrift Abísu's. Zu den sabäischen inschriften. Zum alten Testament. Text der chronik P. S. 197–303.

Winckler (Hugo). Sammlung v. Keilschrifttexten. III. 1. Lfg. gr. 4. L., *E. Pfeiffer.*—III. Die Keilschrifttexte Assurbanipals. 1. Lfg. Prisma R. M. 1. Bruchstücke v. B. K 1732, Col. I–III. 40 S. m. 6.

Zeitschrift f. afrikanische u. oceanische Sprachen. Hrsg. v. A. Seidel. 1. Jahrg. 1895. 4 Hfte. hoch 4. 1. Hft. 96 S. B., *D. Reimer.* m. 12 ; einzelne Hfte., m. 4.

ITALIAN.

Ascoli (G. I.) Il Codice Irlandese dell' Ambrosiana edito e illustrato. Vol. II, punt. 6*a*. Torino. L. 7.20.

Boiardo (M. M.) Le poesie volgari e latine riscontrate sui codici e sulle prime stampe da Angelo Solerti. Bologna. 8vo, p. 495. L. 12.

Bonino (G. B.) Sintassi latina secondo i principii della grammatica storica. Torino. 16mo, p. 608. L. 6.

Cocchia (E.) Antologia di prosa e poesia latina scelta ed annotata ad uso delle scuole. Parte I, libri I a III, per il ginnasio inferiore. Torino. 8vo, p. 351. L. 3.

Decia (G.) Crestomazia latina. Vol. I (Testo). Firenze. 16mo, p. 828. L. 4.

—— Florilegio greco. Parte I. Firenze. L. 2.

De-Vito (L.) Grammatica elementare della lingua tigrina. Roma. 8vo. L. 4.

—— Esercizi di lettura in lingua tigrina. Roma. 8vo. L. 4.

Melzi (Il nuovissimo). Dizionario completo, con 3000 incisioni, 36 carte e 6 tavole. Milano. p. 1450. L. 5.50.

Pignataro-Poltini (G.) C. Valerio Flacco e Apollonio Rodio : saggio critico. Roma. 8vo, p. 202. L. 4.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Acta apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter. Ed. philologica, auctore Fr. Blass. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht*, 1895. 12 m.

Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile. La Mythologie et les Dieux dans les Argonautiques et dans l'Énéide. Thèse présentée à la faculté des lettres de Paris par H. de La Ville de Mirmont. Paris, *Hachette et Cie.*, 1894.

Aristotle, The Politics of. A revised text, with introduction, analysis and commentary by Franz Susemihl and R. D. Hicks. Books I–V. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894.

Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art. With a critical text and a translation of the Poetics by S. H. Butcher. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. $3.30.

Ausonii Mosella (De). Thesim facultati litterarum Parisiensi proponebat H. De la Ville de Mirmont. Paris, *Hachette et Cie.*, 1892.

Austin (Francis M.) Outline Lessons for the Study of Ancient Geography. Boston, New York and Chic., *Leach, Shewell & Sanborn*, 1895.

Bennett (C. E.) A Latin Grammar. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1895. 80 cts.

Bosanquet (Bernard). A Companion to Plato's Republic for English Readers. Being a commentary adapted to Davies and Vaughan's translation. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. $1.75.

Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen. Herausg. von Richard Förster. VII 2. Quaestiones Choricianae. Scripsit Curtius Kirsten. 2 m. 50 pf.

—— VII 3. De Callimachi hymnis quaestiones chronologicae. Scripsit Bruno Ehrlich. 3 m. Breslau, *Wilhelm Koebner*, 1894.

Brinton (D. G.) A Primer of Mayan Hieroglyphics. Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Series in Philology, Literature and Archaeology. Vol. III, No. 2. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1895.

Bruner (James Dowden). The Phonology of the Pistojese Dialect. (J. H. U. Diss.) Baltimore, *Modern Language Assoc. of America*, 1894.

Chaucer, The Student's. Being a complete edition of his works, edited from numerous MSS by W. W. Skeat. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. $1.75.

Cicero's Philippische Reden. I., II., III., VII. Buch. Für den Schulgebr. herausg. von Hermann Nohl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1895. Geb., 60 pf.

Cook (A. S.) A Glossary of the Old Northumbrian Gospels (Lindisfarne Gospels or Durham Book). Halle, *Max Niemeyer*, 1894. 10 m.

Cornelius Nepos, The Lives of. Edited with notes and an introduction on the rapid reading of Latin and the art of translation, by Isaac Flagg. Boston, New York and Chic., *Leach, Shewell & Sanborn*, 1895.

Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Editum consilio et impensis Academiae litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis. Vol. XXX.

S. Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani Opera. Pars II. Carmina. Indices voluminum XXVIIII et XXX ex rec. G. de Hartel.

—— Vol. XXXI. S. Eucherii Lugdunensis Opera omnia. Pars I. Ex rec. Caroli Wotke. MDCCCLXXXXIV.

—— Vol. XXXIII. S. Aureli Augustini Operum Sectio II. S. Augustini Epistulae ex rec. S. Goldbacher. Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, MDCCCLXXXXV.

Dante Society, Thirteenth Annual Report of the (Cambridge, Mass.). Contents : Additions to the Dante Collection at Harvard. Index of Proper Names in the Prose Works and Canzioniere of Dante. By Paget Toynbee. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894.

Dawes (E. A. S.) The Pronunciation of the Greek Aspirates. London, *D. Nutt*, 1895.

Deussen (Paul). Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religionen. Erster Band, erste Abthlg. Allgemeine Einleitung u. Philosophie des Veda bis auf die Upanishad's. Leipzig, *F. A. Brockhaus*, 1894. 7 m.

Dippold (Geo. Theodore). A Scientific German Reader. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1895. $1.

D'Ooge (B. L.) Latin Composition Tablet. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1895.

Educational Review. Ed. by N. M. Butler. January, February, March, 1895. New York, *H. Holt & Co.* $3 per annum.

English (The Oxford) Dictionary. A new English dictionary on historical principles. Ed. by J. A. H. Murray. DECEIT–DEJECT (vol. III). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushing & Co.*, 1895. 60 cts.

Faylor (Geo. A.) The Fable of the Ass. A satire. San Francisco, *C. A. Murdock & Co.*, 1894.

Fortier (Alcée). Histoire de la littérature française. New York, *H. Holt & Co.*, 1894.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung. Herausg. v. Iwan v. Müller. Zwanzigster Halbband. Band VI, Bogen 40–60. Inhalt : Sittl's Archäologie der Kunst. Schluss des Textbandes. München, *C. H. Beck'sche Verlags-Buchhandlung*, 1895. 5 m. 50 pf.

Harman (H. M.) The Use of Our Four Gospels by Justin Martyr. (*Methodist Review*, January, 1895.)

Hartwell (E. W.) Report of Director of Physical Training. School Document No. 8. Boston, *Rockwell & Churchill*, 1894.

Ἑλληνικὴ Γραμματαλογία ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι τῆς ὑπὸ τῶν Τούρκων ἁλώσεως τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ὑπὸ Γεωργίου Μιστριώτου. Τόμος Α΄. Ἐν Ἀθήναις, Π. Δ. Σακελλάριος, 1894.

Holtzner (Eugen). Studien zu Euripides. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1895.

Jenkins (Thos. A.) L'espurgatoire Seint Patriz de Marie de France. With an introduction and a study of the language of the author. (J. H. U. Diss.) Philadelphia, *Ferris*, 1894.

ΚΟΝΤΟΣ (Κ. ΣΤ.) ΦΙΛΟΛΟΓΙΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΑΤΗΡΗΣΕΙΣ. Τεῦχος πρῶτον. Ἀθήνησιν, Πέρρη, 1894.

Modern Language Association (Publications of the). Ed. by J. W. Bright. Vol. X, No. 1. N. S., Vol. III, No. 1. Contents: I. E. S. Lewis. Guernsey, its People and Dialect.—II. Kuno Francke. The Social Aspect of Early German Romanticism.—III. L. A. Sherman. Shakespeare's First Principles of Art. Baltimore, *M. L. Association,* 1895. $1.

Monuments grecs, publiés par l'Association pour l'encouragement des études grecques. Nos. 21-22. 1893-94. Deuxième volume. Paris, *Maisonneuve et Cie.,* 1895.

Musset (Alfred De). A Selection from the Poetry and Comedies of. Edited with an introduction and notes by L. Oscar Kuhns. Boston, *Ginn & Co.,* 1895.

Muzzarelli (Antoine). Academic French Course. First Year. New York, Cinc., Chic., *American Book Co.,* 1895. $1.

Navarre (Octave). Dionysos. Étude sur l'organisation matérielle du théatre athénien. Paris, *C. Klincksieck,* 1895.

Naville (Edouard). The Temple of Dari al Bahari: its Plan, its Founders, and its First Explorers. Twelfth Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund. London and Boston, *Egypt Exploration Fund,* 1894.

Obergermanisch-raetische Limes (Der) des Römerreiches. Im Auftrage der Reichs-Limeskommission herausg. v. O. von Sarwey u. F. Hettner. Heidelberg, *O. Petters,* 1894.

Old South Leaflets: Bradford's Memoir of Elder Brewster, Bradford's First Dialogue, Winthrop's 'Conclusions for the Plantation in New England,' 'New England's First Fruits,' 1643, John Eliot's 'Indian Grammar Begun,' John Cotton's 'God's Promise to His Plantation,' Letters of Roger Williams to Winthrop, and Thomas Hooker's 'Way of the Churches of New England.' Boston, *Directors of the Old South Work,* 1895.

Pancoast (Henry S.) An Introduction to English Literature. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.,* 1894.

Peck (H. T.) and Arrowsmith (R.) Roman Life in Latin Prose and Verse. Illustrative readings from Latin literature. New York, Cinc., Chic., *American Book Co.,* 1895.

Plato's Republic. The Greek text. Edited with notes and essays by the late B. Jowett and L. Campbell. In three vols. Vol. I. Text, with a facsimile. Vol. II. Essays. Vol. III. Notes. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.* New York, *Macmillan & Co.,* 1894. $10.50.

ΠΟΛΙΤΗC (Ν. Γ.) Δημώδεις κοσμογονικοὶ μῦθοι. (Ἐρνέστῳ Κουρτίῳ ἐπὶ τῇ ὀγδοηκοστῇ γενεθλίῳ.) Ἀθήνησιν, Πέρρη, 1894.

Poyen-Bellisle (René de). Les sons et les formes du créole dans les Antilles. (U. of Chic. Diss.) Baltimore, *J. Murphy & Co.,* 1894.

Rentsch (Johannes). Lucianstudien. (Progr. des Plauenschen Gymnasium, Ostern 1895.) Plauen i. V., *M. Wieprecht,* 1895.

Revue d'exégèse mythologique et biblique. Redigée par L'Abbé E. Fourrière. 3e année. No. 15. Sept.-Oct. 1894. Amiens, *Bureau de la Revue.*

Revue des Revues et Publications d'académies relatives à l'antiquité classique. Année et tome XVIII. Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1894.

Schelling (Felix E.) A Book of Elizabethan Lyrics. (Athenaeum Press Series.) Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1895.

Schenkl (Karl). Griechisches Elementarbuch. Sechszehnte, verbesserte Auflage von Heinrich Schenkl. 1. Theil: Uebungsstücke. 2. Theil: Erklärende Anmerkungen u. Wörterverzeichnisse. Wien u. Prag, *F. Tempsky*, 1895. 1 fl. 30 kr.

Sewanee Review (The). Ed. by W. P. Trent. Feb. 1895. Vol. III, No. 2. $3 per annum.

Steiner (Bernard C.) History of Education in Maryland. (Contributions to American Educational History. Ed. by Herbert B. Adams. No. 19.) Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1894.

Thucydides. Book I. Ed., with introduction and notes, by W. H. Forbes. With maps. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1895. $2.25.

Türk (G.) De Hyla. (Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen, herausg. v. Richard Förster. VII. Band, Heft 4.) Breslau, *Koebner*, 1895.

Tyrrell (R. Y.) Latin Poetry. Lectures delivered on the Percy Turnbull Memorial Foundation in the Johns Hopkins University. Boston and New York, *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*, 1895.

Vergili (P. V. Maronis) Opera omnia, recensuerunt T. L. Papillon et A. E. Haigh. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1895. 6s.

Watkins (Mildred C.) American Literature. (Literature Primers.) New York, Cinc., Chic., *American Book Co.*, 1895. 20 cts.

Weil (H.) Inscriptions et papyrus grecs d'Égypte. (Revue des Études grecques.) Paris, 1895.

—— Remarques sur des textes d'Horace et de Cicéron. (Revue de Philologie, Janvier 1895.) (Tirage à part.)

—— Sur un morceau suspect de l'Antigone de Sophocle. (Revue des Études grecques.) (Tirage à part.) Paris, 1895.

Weymouth (R. F.) On the Rendering into English of the Greek Aorist and Perfect. (Repr. from the *Theological Monthly* for July and Sept. 1890.) London, *David Nutt*, 1894. 1s.

CORRECTION.

By a curious accident in copying for the press my notice of Professor JURENKA's *Novae Lectiones Pindaricae* (A. J. P. XV 509), a line or more was omitted and a grievous wrong done, for which reparation is made here so far as reparation for such blunders is possible. Read therefore, l. 8: "σὺν αὖ τᾷ τᾷ Πελίαο φόνῳ κτέ., <of which, I venture to say, Professor JURENKA will repent some day as much he repents now of> taking μίγεν in the sense of μίγεν φιλότητι." In point of fact, Prof. JURENKA's emendation was intended to prevent the very misunderstanding of the text into which he himself had fallen in his early Pindaric studies.